DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 155 177 95 TM 006 294

AUTHOR Trask, Anne E.
TITLE Experience-Based Career Education: An Interorganizational Analysis. External Evaluator's Final Report on the Experience-Based Career Education Programs, Volume IX.
INSTITUTION Educational Testing Service, Berkeley, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jan 76
CONTRACT NIE-C-74-0118
NOTE 112p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document; For related documents, see TM 006 289-295, 525, and 927

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Education; Cooperative Planning; Curriculum Development; Educational Innovation; *Evaluation Methods; Government School Relationship; High School Students; Interagency Coordination; Interagency Planning; Learning Activities; Models; *Organization; Program Development; Program Evaluation; *School Industry Relationship; School Systems; Senior High Schools; *Work Experience Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Experience Based Career Education Program

ABSTRACT

The Experience-Based Career Education (EBCE) program was designed to provide on-site vocational experiences for high school youth in order to promote: (1) career development skills and knowledge; (2) self-knowledge--interests, abilities, and values; (3) reading skills; (4) problem solving skills; (5) oral communication; (6) writing skills; (7) interpersonal skills; (8) basic quantitative skills; and (9) maturation skills. The problems of coordinating the goals and activities of national, regional, state, and local organizations involved in the EBCE program were analyzed separately for each of the four local EBCE sites. These problems included the task of enlisting the support of private employers, developing a permanent autonomous local Advisory Council, establishing learning centers, and coordinating the program with the local public school system. The approaches used in the interorganizational analysis are described: the employer-based approach, the curriculum development emphasis, the school system-proof model, and the school system incorporation model. (CTM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED155177

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

EXPERIENCE-BASED CAREER EDUCATION: AN INTERORGANIZATIONAL ANALYSIS

BY

ANNE E. TRASK
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EXTERNAL EVALUATOR'S FINAL REPORT ON THE
EXPERIENCE-BASED CAREER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

VOLUME IX

Submitted to the
National Institute of Education
of the
U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Contract No. NIE-C-74-0118

Reginald Corder, Project Director

Educational Testing Service
1947 Center Street
Berkeley, California 94704

January 1976

TM006 294

EXTERNAL EVALUATOR'S FINAL REPORTS ON THE EXPERIENCE-BASED CAREER EDUCATION PROGRAM

Volume I	Summary Evaluation of Four Experience-Based Career Education Schools
Volume II	Experience-Based Career Education in Charleston, West Virginia: An Anthropological Perspective
Volume III	Experience-Based Career Education in Oakland, California: An Anthropological Perspective
Volume IV	The Academy for Career Education: An Ethnographic Evaluation
Volume V	An Ethnographic Account of $(CE)_2$: Experience-Based Career Education in Tigard, Oregon
Volume VI	Student Outcomes and Participant Opinions in Experience-Based Career Education Schools
Volume VII	Search for and Development of Instruments Measuring Student Outcomes of Experience-Based Career Education Programs
Volume VIII	Behavioral Observations at Far West School: A Description of Experience-Based Career Education
Volume IX	Experience-Based Career Education: An Interorganizational Analysis

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
1	Introduction	1
	Initiation and Development of the EBCE Program	2
	Characteristics of the Program	10
2	The National Program	15
	The Social Context of the EBCE Program	15
	Constraints on the EBCE Program	16
	The Strategy of Innovation	19
	Organizational and Administrative Analysis	21
3	NWREL/EBCE: The Employer-Based Approach	23
	The Employer-Based Approach	23
	EBCE-Employer Relationships	25
	EBCE-School System Inter-relationships	28
	EBCE-Advisory Board Relationship	31
4	FWL/EBCE: The Curriculum Development Emphasis	35
	The Curriculum Development Emphasis	36
	EBCE-Employer Relationships	37
	EBCE-School System Relationships	43
	EBCE-Policy Advisory Board Relationships	51
5	AEL/EBCE: The School System-Proof Model	57
	The School System-Proof Model	57
	EBCE-Employers Relationships	58
	EBCE-School System Relations	65
	EBCE-Community Advisory Council Relations	72

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Chapter		Page
6	RBS/EBCE: The School System Incorporation Model	77
	The School System Incorporation Model	78
	EBCE-Employer Relationships	79
	EBCE-School Systems Relations	89
	EBCE-Advisory Board Relationships	97
7	Conclusions and Implications	107
	The Limitations of Official Records	107
	EBCE, Interorganizational Relationships, and Change	108
	Cautions about Using the Findings of Sociological Inquiry	109

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

From an organizational point of view, the Experience Based Career Education Program (EBCE) is an alliance of cooperating agencies--the National Institute of Education (NIE), regional educational laboratories, state departments of education, school systems, and employers. Given this characteristic, interorganizational relations in which organizations are the unit of analysis are the focus of the inquiry into program administration. NIE and the educational laboratories have assumed that cooperative relations among the organizations participating in, and necessary to, the program can readily be established and maintained. From the perspective of the sociology of oganizations, the validity of such an assumption is problematic. In interorganizational analysis, a conflict in values between organizations (for example, the laboratories and employers) and the desirability of both values in conflict are taken as givens. Such an interorganizational analysis starts with the assumption that a situation of partial conflict exists between organizations and examines the forms of social interaction that occur under such circumstances as well as the types of social behavior that take place under conditions of unstructured authority. In the instance of the EBCE programs a degree of coordination among organizations is necessary to maintain the program, yet, there is no formal authority which can impose cooperation.[1]

These considerations suggest that if the evaluator is to study the attainment of goals, he must study the "system" goals, i.e., "those that help maintain the viability of the program in its environment,"[2] as well as the "outcome" goals. By doing so, he will learn the reasons for modifications in the program that have occurred and "where the real game is." The particular organizational characteristics of EBCE, then, warrant a systematic analysis of the systems that affect the program.

---

1. Eugene Litwak and Lydia Hylton, "Interorganizational Analysis: A Hypothesis on Coordinating Agencies," Administrative Science Quarterly, VI (March 1962), pp. 396-399.

2. Carol H. Weiss, Evaluation Research: Methods of Assessing Program Effectiveness, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972), p. 29

Initiation and Development of the EBCE Program

In 1970, a Development Planning Team in the National Center for Educational Research and Development (NCERD) of the U.S. Office of Education (OE) examined intensively the problem of "unemployability" in American society. Their concern was stated as follows:

> All individuals in American society desiring or needing employment should be able to secure and pursue it in a manner satisfying to them and to society. The problem is that identifiable groups and individuals in our society, to different degrees, at different times, and in different ways do not participate in the realization of this goal. Significant social, economic and personal cost results.[3]

In carrying out its review, the strategy used by the Development Planning Team was to (1) identify the causes of unemployability and, in turn, subject them to more detailed causal analysis; (2) specify the conditions which could eliminate the causes; (3) delineate criteria for assessing whether proposed objectives were systemic; (4) recommend the seven solutions or objectives in which the group had the greatest confidence; and (5) enumerate other objectives that had been considered.

In connection with the study team's first objective, their analysis of unemployability as a social problem led to the identification of its nine causes:[4]

1. Poor self-concept
2. Lack of marketable skill
3. Poor elementary problem-solving skills
4. Poor job market information
5. Poor motivation
6. Lack of credentials
7. No market for available skills
8. Discrimination
9. Value conflict[5]

---

3. Charles B. Stalford, "EBCE: A Conceptual Analysis," Paper written for the Career Education Program, National Institute of Education, May 1974 p. I-6.

4. Ibid., p. I-6.

5. Memo from Hendrick Gideonse to Harry S. Silberman, Progress to Date of the Development Planning Team, 1/29/71 (unnumbered) as quoted in Stalford, op. cit.

In the next phase, the Development Planning Team specified the conditions which, if realized, should ameliorate the causes of unemployability.[6] These were:

1. Increased options
2. Greater free choice
3. Increased accountability
4. Broader definitions of skill and role objectives legitimized
5. Enhanced feedback loops
6. Credentialling based on performance
7. Integrated work and learning
8. Operationalizing the concept that perpetual change is a fundamental characteristic of employment and society.

From these characteristics, specific programmatic recommendations were derived. The EBCE concept was one such programmatic recommendation; others included a statewide revision of credentialling requirements, a national educational TV effort in career education, and a home-based career education system. The then Commissioner of Education, Sidney P. Marland, Jr., reviewed with OE senior staff the 17 recommendations at a weekend retreat. At that time, the EBCE concept was selected as one of three to four recommendations to be developed into programs. The description of the proposed EBCE program contained in the NCERD recommendations was:

> A career education development program, industry-based at the secondary level, which would be created, developed and entirely supported by a consortium of industrial, commercial and other employers and organizations, as well as unions. The program would offer open-enrollment, nontuition alternatives to the public schools' offerings of academic and vocational tracks. Among other outputs, this program would incorporate paid work as an integral part of the educational program, blend academic general and vocational programs and emphasize interaction of life, work roles, requirements and values.[7]

To develop the EBCE concept in detail, a number of educational, administrative, legal, fiscal, political and other problems had to be solved. In addition to in-house

---

6. Ibid., P. I-7

7. Ibid., P. I-9

papers discussing these issues, feasibility study contracts were awarded in June 1971 to Research for Better Schools, Inc. (RBS) and the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development (FWL) "for data collection, analysis, and further elaboration of the EBCE concept and ramifications."[8] After OE decided to omit the competitve procurement of proposals from interested organizations (large individual employers, consortia of employers, combinations of types of institutions) to develop and test programs, RBS and FWL were directed in October 1971 "to develop operationalized pilot EBCE programs and conclude work on the feasibility studies."[9] Since the settings of both projects were large inner-city areas with essentially similar populations, two additional sites, one in a suburban-rural area (at Tigard, Oregon, under the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory [NWREL]) and one in Appalachia (Appalachia Educational Laboratory [AEL] at Charleston and Kanawha County, West Virginia), received feasibility study grants and subsequent funding for operational programs.

In August 1972, the EBCE contracts were transferred to the new Career Education Task Force in NIE. Under OE and then NIE, the four regional educational laboratories began the design and development of the program under a mandate described as "directed development." That is, they were "to meet a set of specified characteristics in the areas of populations served, program characteristics, and general outcomes. Within these paramaters, the laboratories were free to develop their own approaches to staffing, curriculum, credentialling, logistics, and operating procedures."[10] A staff paper notes that:

> The values of such a strategy were that operational EBCE programs would be created quickly and that such programs could be used as a test bed for obtaining hard data about EBCE's potential and problems. The disadvantages were the high risk nature of the projects (they might take a totally ineffective direction) and the difficulties of simultaneously developing, operating, and evaluating a complex program.[11]

---

8. Ibid., p. I-2
9. Ibid., P. I-3
10. Ibid., pp. I-4 - I-5
11. Ibid., p. II-1

This strategy is particularly noteworthy because it marks the change to an active, from a passive, relation to curriculum development on the part of OE. During the 1960's, the curriculum reform projects in various subject areas, including those funded by the National Science Foundation (NSF) and OE, exercised influence by organizational arrangements that depended on voluntary relations among public agencies and private groups. These patterns represented ways of affecting the grassroots level of operation in education, where no formal authority can impose cooperation.[12] They also circumvented probable Congressional and popular opposition to courses designed for national school use, opposition which might have been aroused if a Federal agency had mandated the courses directly. In the instance of EBCE, a Federal agency, NIE, by means of contracts to regional educational laboratories, which were established and funded initially by the Federal government, has been closely directing the development of an experimental curriculum, designed to solve the social problem of unemployability and to reform vocational education. Sensitivity to the possible issue of Federal control over one segment of education was indicated by former Commissioner Marland in 1972, when he emphasized that:

> (1) ...We had declined, and to this date continue to decline, to lay out a concrete Federal definition of Career Education. We have chosen to shun a Federal 'approved solution.'
>
> (2) If it is to be truly effective, it must not be a Federal program; it must be a self-determining reform by local school systems, encouraged and assisted by State leadership.[13]

The extent to which these pronouncements have allayed and forestalled concerns about the contingency of Federal influence in this area is difficult to ascertain; one indicator may be that Congressional resistance to career education on these grounds has never occurred.

---

12. Burton R. Clark, "Interorganizational Patterns in Education," Administrative Science Quarterly, X (Sept. 1965), p. 229.

13. Sidney P. Marland, Jr., "Foreword" in Larry McClure and Carolyn Buan (editors), Essays on Career Education (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973), pp. ix-x.

The organizational analysis should allow us to determine the degree of control NIE has actually, rather than theoretically, exerted over the evolution of the EBCE program and the means by which control has been exercised, as well as to identify some consequences of the strategy of directed development for NIE, the regional educational laboratories, and the program.

The four programs became "operational," i.e., students were enrolled, in September 1972; the first developmental year was completed in June 1973. The name of the program was changed in December 1973 from "Employer-Based" to "Experience-Based." Stalford comments that this shift "is congruent, perhaps coincidently, with less emphasis placed upon the structure of organizational involvement and more on the educational process."[14]

After approximately two years of development, the EBCE concept had evolved and changed so that it was described as: "a comprehensive and individualized community based educational program for adolescents which permits the student to acquire significant knowledge about life skills and the world of work."[15] Additional characteristics, which highlight the changes that have occurred since the original NCERD conception (cited earlier on page 3), are:

1. Community rather than industry-based;

2. Future financial support will come from public sources not from private sector;

3. Created and developed by four regional educational laboratories but with strong policy or advisory roles played by community organizations and individuals;

4. No students are paid;

5. Emphasis upon individualization and student choice;

6. Translation of experiences into credit for graduation has become a major feature of the system;

---

14. Stalford, op. cit., p. II-9

15. Ibid., p. IV-1

7. Recognition that EBCE may cause systemic change in many ways but that it is not likely to survive in total isolation from the public schools.[16]

At this point, some interpretive comments about the initiation and development of the EBCE program are in order. In examining the organizational characteristics that are necessary in virtually any social experiment, Riecken and Boruch have identified and specified the functions of the initiator-sponsor.[17] (In the present instance, NIE plays this role.) These functions will be used as benchmarks by which the development of EBCE can be assessed. They are:

1. Identify the social problem(s) that is causing or motivating proposals for intervention. Are these problems sufficiently widespread and sufficiently debilitating to the society to merit the relatively high cost (in terms of both dollars and staff resources) generally required for experimentation? Is the problem now of interest to policy-makers? More important, is it still likely to be of interest when the results become available?

2. Determine what is known about the proposed intervention. Exhaustive literature searches and "state of the art" studies may not be required before an experiment is undertaken, but the initiator-sponsor should have a comprehensive understanding of the intervention that will be tested, the circumstances (if any) under which it has already been tried, the effects it is likely to have on its subjects (including side or negative effects), and the policy implications of its success or failure.

3. Determine whether or not experimentation can increase understanding of the proposed intervention. An experiment is not always the

---

16. Idem

17. Henry W. Reicken and Robert E. Boruch (editors), Social Experimentation: A Method for Planning and Evaluating Social Intervention (New York: Academic Press, Inc., 1974).

only way to obtain estimates of program effects. Evaluation of existing programs can sometimes indicate the probable effects of a new program; theoretical models can be constructed to estimate a potential impact; survey research can offer insights. Will an experiment be the most cost-effective means of examining the proposed intervention? Does it offer the most viable means of influencing policy?

5. Determine the political feasibility of the experiment. Does it appear that interest groups will allow the experiment to mounted? Is the experiment likely to jeopardize other programs through loss of political support by Congress or the funding decision-makers? If the experiment succeeds in demonstrating desirable program effects, is it likely that the program can be "sold" and mounted?[18]

In evaluating the multi-stage process which NIE utilized to review existing knowledge and to assay the significance of the social problem of unemployability, it appears, from the documentation available, that the problem identification phase meets acceptable standards. The analysis of the causes of unemployability seems to have been thoroughly and carefully carried out. However, the reasoning underlying the conclusion of the policy planners that the EBCE program, rather than another alternative, would be able to eliminate unemployability in the foreseeable future cannot be discovered from the secondary sources.

It has been noted that "the definition of the [social] problem suggests the targets and the methods of intervention, the change strategy, and the choice of a social action delivery system."[19] Problem definition makes assumptions about the causes of the problem and where they lie. For example, the explanation of unemployability by OE staff members is basically person-centered, rather than situation-centered. The cause--in seven of the nine reasons listed--is within the unemployable person: he has a poor self-concept, poor problem-solving skills, is poorly motivated, and so forth. Only discrimination and

---

18. Ibid., pp. 208-209.

19. Ibid., p. 2[illegible].

lack of a market for available skills placed the causes in the situation in which the individual is located. The social intervention that was recommended, EBCE, was accordingly individual-centered, focusing on education, training, and counseling. It is not clear that the Development Planning Team was aware that a focus on either person-centered or situation-centered causes may pre-empt planning, so that alternative explanations, including joint causation from individual and situation sources, are not taken into account.

The source of professional or technical advice about a policy issue is also a major factor in problem definition. Every profession views the world from a particular perspective. For example, psychologists tend towards person-centered explanations of social problems while economists seek the reasons in the market or some other situational circumstance. Policymakers can resolve this "problem" by being aware of the professional biases of the experts they consult and, since social issues are complex, by consulting experts from more than one discipline. It is also most important to be cognizant "that the choice of treatment to be used in the experiment will be influenced by the professional (as well as by the political, administrative, ideological, and, perhaps, personal) biases of those who make the decisions."[20] In this area, the planning for EBCE was notably deficient. Awareness of the types of explanations generally promulgated for social problems, the professional biases of those involved in planning and initiating the program and the need to counter-balance them, and the possible influences of professional and other biases on the mode of treatment to be employed in the experiment are lacking. The limited utilization of outside experts in the development of the program is also noticeable. While a "panel of critics" did review the in-house papers and planning memos of NIE staff, their major contribution was a collection of essays on career education, not input to program development.

The number and type of changes in the EBCE concept during a two-year period suggest that NIE did not have an inclusive understanding of the intervention to be tested, its likely effects on potential subjects, and the implications of the success or failure of particular elements. Successful planning is not necessarily measured by the absence of any modifications in the program; such a yard-

---

20. Ibid., p. 211.

stick would be unreasonable. A caveat should be entered here that units responsible for policy analysis, review, and planning in major government agencies did not exist in some cases or grow in others until the mid-1960's. Even taking this into account, the modifications of the EBCE program during its initial years suggest that the planning for major social intervention programs in education needs to be improved.

There is no information available in the secondary sources to determine whether the OE staff considered alternatives to experimentation as a means of increasing understanding of the proposed intervention. Relevant to this issue in an oblique way, Stalford has commented briefly on how NIE can profit most from its investment in EBCE: "Two possibilities present themselves: (1) NIE with its laboratory partners continues to develop EBCE as a program mechanism with a possible variation in total programming . . . .; (2) NIE and its partners concentrate on providing technical assistance and informed resources to the general development of work education programs."[21] His remarks indicate that the political and economic feasibility of the experiment were not systematically and carefully reviewed. In particular, the obvious question, "If the experiment succeeds in demonstrating desirable program effects, is it likely that the program can be "sold" and mounted,"[22] was not considered, except in very cursory fashion, early on in the development of the EBCE program and represents a serious inadequacy in program planning and development.

Characteristics of the Program

Since the feasibility studies indicated the program could not literally be employer based because "employment sites were not equipped to provide, and employers didn't want to adapt to, all of the educational needs of youth,"[23] EBCE is located external to both schools and employers, with one exception (RBS). While the formal arrangements differ slightly, each EBCE school is an adjunct to a regional educational laboratory. Although each EBCE program is independent, some characteristics are common to all four sites.

---

21. Stafford, op. cit., pp. iv-17 - 18.

22. Reicken and Boruch, op. cit., p. 209.

23. Keith Goldhammer, "Extending Career Education Beyond the Schoolhouse Walls." a lecture delivered at Ohio State University, May 24, 1975, p. 3.

1. Each EBCE school is an alternative to the regular high school.

2. Each site enrolls students who are juniors, seniors, or both.

3. Each school is required by the terms of its NIE contract to permit the students enrolled in the program to complete graduation requirements. As a consequence, formal arrangements have been made with all participating high schools for the student's work in the EBCE program to be assessed for credits.

4. Each program had to provide students the opportunity to gain experience, minimal job entry skills, or both, through their involvement at an employer site.

5. Students enrolled in the program take both general and special educational studies on an individualized basis.

6. A guidance component oriented toward a career choice in addition to, a personal development had to be integrally related to the instructional program.[24]

Goldhammer has identified and elaborated the features which distinguish the EBCE models from the patterns of the traditional high school:[25]

1. EECE is based upon a clinical mode of operation, in which the individual is studied and his particular status, needs, aspirations, interests, concerns, capabilities, deficiencies, and potentialities are diagnosed.

2. The program is student-centered and emphasizes maximum flexibility in order to achieve student needs.

3. The program is individualized and can be modified as a student's development, interests, identifications of strengths and deficiencies, and aspirations do. The curriculum defines only areas in which knowledge must be gained or proficiencies attained.

---

24. Ibid., pp. 3-4

25. Ibid., pp. 8-14

4. The student's learning experiences are exploratory and instrumental for achieving personal objectives of the student.

5. The educational program utilizes a systemic approach. "Although sequences are not dictated, the possible sequence relationships and the designation of the elements and paths through which they may be incorporated within the student's program have been clearly established."[26]

6. The EBCE program views the whole educational enterprise as instrumental to the student's achieving the mastery that will help him become a participating and contributing member of society; it de-emphasizes aesthetics, athletic skills, and performing arts.

7. The community is involved in the education program through participating employer sites and resource persons. In this connection, Goldhammer remarks that "although there is a physical location for each of the EBCE schools, it is conceivable that at some time in the future there will be 'branch offices' of the school dispersed throughout the community for the convenience of the students as they relate to specific community activities."[27]

8. Guidance and counseling are integrated with the instructional program of EBCE. While guidance is primarily oriented toward career planning and decision-making, it is significant that students frequently see their counselors and work with them systematically or informally, as they please. From the other perspective, the guidance counselor tries to establish a link with the student; home on a cooperative basis.

9. Technology and media are used in the individualization of instruction.

10. The record system is designed to meet the developmental needs of the EBCE program, rather than the school district's archives. A student's record becomes a diagnostic instrument which helps to determine where he is going, the deficiencies he is experiencing, the accomplishments upon which he can build, the decisions that are being made, and the alternatives which have been discarded.

---

26. Ibid., p. 11

27. Ibid., p. 11

11. EBCE demonstrates what happens when instructional, development, and assessment teams either work together or in coordinate fashion.

That social intervention programs are complex undertakings, incorporating a range of components, styles, people, and procedures, is an observation which is almost a truism. However, it is still the case that "unless there is some reasonably accurate and coherent definition of the program, the evaluator does not know to what to attribute the outcomes he observes."[28] The organizational and administrative analysis can contribute to determining which of the elements described above are necessary for the effects the program achieves and which are not essential. Since the decision makers want to know what characteristics "worked" or "didn't work", what is it that should be adopted or modified, information on the organizationally-relevant elements as they affected the nature of the program is required.

It is also the case that "the evaluator has to discover the reality of the program rather than its illusion."[29] Since I had the opportunity to observe the program in operation and to check on its basic conceptualization by the sponsor and the developer, I am informed and aware of what is actually taking place. Having satisfied this requisite for a valid evaluation, the next step is to describe and analyze the national program.

---

28. Weiss, op. cit., p. 44

29. Idem.

CHAPTER 2

THE NATIONAL PROGRAM

"The nature of (a social) experiment depends largely on the nature of the organizations involved in it."[1] That is, agencies with specific substantive missions (for example, education) will define problems and propose experiments different from those with other charges, such as labor, or from policy development groups outside such agencies. Further, the nature of the organizations determines the features of design that will be stressed and the way experimental results will be used. To understand the roles of the organizations participating in the EBCE program, their interrelationships, and some of the consequences of the particular combination of roles for this social intervention, the national program must be examined as well as EBCE programs at the individual sites. In this chapter we will describe and analyze the social context of the EBCE program, the constraints on the national program, and the strategy of innovation.

The Social Context of the EBCE Program

Education has emerged and remained as a national concern, in addition to its importance as an issue at the state and local levels, during the last twenty years. Clark remarks that "the national concern has its most potent form in the interest of the Federal government in the outputs of education. The Federal interest is, of course, actually an array of interests. This array deals with manpower and unemployment, leadership and creativity, and, urban and rural renewal, thus involving the Office of Education, the Department of Labor, and even the Bureau of the Budget."[2] At present, a critical interest is the role of education in preparing men and women for work, with a particular emphasis on the continuous change that characterizes occupations, labor force participation, and society. The concern has been compelling enough to call forth an attempt at a national program to reform vocational education, which was depicted as being too narrow in focus and resistant to change, as well as to solve the social problem of unemployability.

---

1. Riecken and Boruch, op. cit., p. 204.

2. Clark, op. cit., p. 227.

The EBCE program also reflects the context in which it was developed. Most importantly, the funds made available for developing this career education model were allocated under the provisions of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended, as agreed at a 1971 meeting between the U.S. Office of Education and the Commission of Chief State School Officers. This circumstance led to some emphasis, in the initial phase of development, on reforming vocational education. It was also the case that key members of the Development Planning Team were economists, some of whom had previously worked in the Department of Labor. Thus, the recommendation for the EBCE program was generated from considering possible solutions to the social problem of unemployability, rather than as an educational issue. Such a program would have to be effected through the existing educational structure, either by changing it or bypassing it.

Constraints on the EBCE Program

The EBCE program was mounted from a position of strength and authority in some areas, but of vulnerability in others. Experience-based career education was intended to be a viable high school curriculum; simultaneously, it would be a means of reforming vocational education from within the established structure. This plan provided legitimacy for its proposals, but the limitations imposed by the structure of the educational system as well as a strategy which involved establishing an alternative educational program not under the control of a school system have resulted in restricting the kind and amount of change anticipated.

Political constraints. While career education is promulgated as a "new" concept, programs such as EBCE are encumbered from their inception by traditional attitudes toward vocational education in addition to the existing structure of funding and of federal-state-city relations. Many critics contend that career education, and EBCE, are only the most recent educational fads; that they are broad in scope and ill-defined; that they represent a new fundamentalism which stresses the work ethic but not the creation of new jobs nor the restructuring of old ones to increase employment; and that they may reinforce inequality by permitting the tracking of minority students very early in school.

Approximately 20 percent of the budget for public and private vocational education comes from the federal government. This circumstance limits the power of NIE to

press for needed reforms, since the funding source determines the locus of power. The states, which support almost 40 percent of the existing vocational programs, have often accepted new federal programs and priorities slowly, for example, cooperative education and programs for inner-city minority students, while at the same time they have reluctantly scaled down those in agriculture and home economics. They are acknowledging, of course, their rural constituents, as well as reflecting the insulated attitudes and disinclination of some state vocational education agencies to change. Furthermore, federal legislation and administrative practice includes competing and ambiguous allocation formulas, which allow states to short-change the cities without penalty.

Some change has obviously taken place since the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and the 1968 amendments. However, the modal pattern is probably toward the maintenance of the status quo. At the state level, it has been noted that more money is requested for basically the same programs, while they are renamed to convey an appearance of reform. Many states have demurred at following federally established priorities, and the extent to which the many reforms spelled out in the 1963 and 1968 legislation have been implemented can be seriously questioned. A restructuring of funding patterns and of federal-state-city relations are important factors in determining if recommendations for change, such as EBCE, can be successfully implemented. For example, a strategy for delegating greater authority to Washington and the local system should be developed to counteract the conservative and self-perpetuating tendencies of state vocational education agencies.

Program structure. Some characteristics of the program functioned as constraints: (1) final control being at the local or unit level; (2) a temporary systems strategy; and (3) internal complexity.[3]

While the national program does have specific and limited authority, substantially increased by the mandate of directed development, over the regional educational laboratories, the participating school systems, employers, unions, and state departments of education could neglect, ignore, or countervail directives or suggestions that infringed on their autonomy. Even a series of "minor"

---

3. Ronald G. Corwin, Reform and Organizational Survival (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1973), p. 316.

changes by one or several participating agencies at the local level would have an accumulative effect on the program that could influence its outcomes.

Second, the EBCE program utilizes a temporary systems strategy vis-a-vis the regional educational laboratories. Originally, the development of the prototype models of the program for grades 7-12 was expected to take five years. Although the EBCE program revised its target populations to grades 10-12, the anticipated period of development remains the same. For the laboratories, the EBCE program has always been a term project which would not become a permanent part of their structure. Funding, renewed annually, would be forthcoming for five years, and the project staff would hold yearly appointments, for the most part. Due in some measure to the uncertainty regarding the level of funding for each year as well as the timing of the award, there has been a moderate rate of turnover among program staff.

Third, the program is internally complex, with several distinct components which vary in their designation at each educational laboratory. Generally, they can be designated as the core program, the optional electives, and the work experience program. It appears that adopting school systems will not have to accept the entire program, but can select those parts which are most appropriate to their needs.

Local constraints. The national Career Education Program (CEP) had given a mandate to four regional educational laboratories to develop an employer-based career education program. In turn, the laboratories had to work with and through state department of education and local school systems to implement the prototype models developed. Such a process implied, in part, that the previous lack of intergration between education and work resulted from short-sightedness, if not from deficient goals, on the part of the school systems. The national program did require assurances from a laboratory in any doubtful situation that EBCE was not under the control of the participating school system, thus assuring that the innovative program would not be co-opted by the established system. But, while the federal government could prevent apparent local control over EBCE, they could not influence the type of participating school selected by local laboratory administrators. Thus, the EBCE program was subject to additional constraints arising at the local school level.

The Strategy of Innovation

Given these constraints, what mechanisms facilitated the EBCE program's continued existence and its functioning at a level higher than survival? As with other large Federal programs of social intervention, a major tactic used to resolve these problems can be categorized as goal transformations.

Goal transformations. The original program goals were enumerated in, and evolved out of, statements of objectives of the Development Planning Team, in-house papers commissioned to explore and elaborate specific aspects of the EBCE concept, and the feasibility studies conducted by RBS and FWL. Formal guidelines for the program were issued only during the first year of the program; since then, informal statements by CEP and correspondence have been used, most likely because of the small number of organizations funded. A succinct summary of the goals of the EBCE program at its initiation is presented below:

> ...The original program objectives included personal and career skills as well as basic academic growth. The latter was stated in terms of gaining academic skills to interact with commercial society. The capacity of the student to become a self-directing individual capable of reacting to a constantly changing society through exposure to various experiences was foreseen. Finally, a substantial expectation existed that EBCE would stimulate substantial change in the institutional relationships among schools, employers, and other community groups.[4]

The goals, as stated, are so general in wording that it is impossible to derive directions for an innovative alternative education program from them; further, no priorities among objectives were established. In August, 1972 as the four laboratories began their design and development of EBCE, it became apparent that "even the goals [as set forth] were subject to interpretation, however, and both the government and the labs were obliged to spend time reclarifying the intended objectives of the project as the eventual shape they might take was not always clear."[5]

---

4. Stalford, op. cit., p. I-18

5. Ibid., p. I-5.

Because of the absence of formal program guidelines, it is difficult to determine the continuity and/or changes in the EBCE program's goals. In Stalford's in-house paper, it is noted that: "'unemployability' has been mentioned here only to describe the genesis of the program and not necessarily to suggest that reducing unemployability is now the principal objective for the program...nevertheless, the skills which CEP sees as facilitating access to careers for youth are quite similar conceptually to causes of unemployability cited by the USOE study group. Regardless of how attractive EBCE may be for non-career education related reasons, both the original conceptualization and subsequent program development suggest that the principal grounds for support of EBCE ought to be related to CEP goals for youth, namely career choice, access and entry."[6] There is an emphasis on the continuity of goals, at a general level, from the inception of the program, but considerable fuzziness exists because the goals for youth, CEP, and EBCE are not distinguished.

The clarification of goals for EBCE occurred gradually. During the first year of operation, "in one form or another, each of the programs included goals in the area of basic skills, usually construed of as being cognitive, but sometimes including affective and psychomotor skills; life skills, including interpersonal relationships; and career skills, which extended the student's knowledge about himself and the world of work."[7] In each program's FY 1974 Operating Plan for the second year (1973-74), attention was directed in one section to program goals "which with varying terminology and structure, included goals in the basic, life, and career skills areas. A hierarchical goal structure, ranging from the most global to increasingly specific objectives, was also included; the most specific goals approached the style of behavioral objectives in terminology and in some cases were guides to actual student learning activities."[8] In December 1973, the possibility of developing a common set of goals for the EBCE programs was discussed at a project director's meeting. FWL had initiated informally such a project with Educational Testing Service earlier, but it had not been concluded. The project directors concurred that completing a study on the degree to which commonality of goals existed would be useful, and that

---

6. Ibid., pp. II-2-II-3.

7. Ibid., pp. II-2-II-3.

8. Idem.

the report of the study would then be presented to representatives of the four programs for their approval or dissent. The completed study was reviewed in January and nine major common goal areas of EBCE were agreed on: career development skills and knowledge; self-knowledge--interests, abilities, and values; reading skills; problem-solving skills; oral communication; writing skills; interpersonal skills; basic quantitative skills; and maturation skills.

On the one hand, the NIE staff paper identifies self-knowledge, problem-solving and interpersonal skills, and career development skills and knowledge as goals that might be considered atypical for an ordinary American high school. On the other hand, it states that "the difference between EBCE and traditional high schools would not lie in comparing formal goal statements for either type of institution; a district-wide statement of goals would probably encompass the same breadth of objectives as EBCE. The difference presumably lies in structuring an educational program to consciously foster and recognize growth in these personal areas while also aiding, or at least not hurting, development in traditional academic skills."[9] It appears to be very difficult on the basis of the global "outcome" goals that have been developed for the EBCE program, for NIE or the individual programs to build a strong case for the distinctiveness of the program. The uniqueness of EBCE seems to lie rather in the "system" goals, i.e., "those that help maintain the viability of the program in its environment."[10] Actually, they constitute the covert goals of the project, that are not likely to be enumerated as objectives, but whose attainment, in this instance, will determine its success or failure. And it is the modification of the system goals, rather than the outcome goals, that have enabled the program not only to survive, but to succeed.

Organizational and Administrative Analysis

The organizational and administrative analysis of the EBCE program includes (in subsequent chapters) in addition to the discussion of the national program, an interorganizational analysis of each site, and a brief cross-site examination of organizational structure and change. An analysis of the official records produced by

---

9. Ibid., p. II-5.

10. Carol H. Weiss, Evaluation Research (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972), p. 29.

each project as it was established and began functioning as a going concern is used to carry out the descriptive analysis of interorganizational relationships. Changes in relations between the EBCE program and employers, school systems, and the Advisory Boards, and the reasons for those changes are given particular attention since they will be informative with respect to the feasibility of and constraints on similar programs elsewhere. The content analysis of planning documents and reports reveals important dimensions of the formal organization of the programs and their development over their three-year lives. Interviews with EBCE project directors and key staff members at each site and secondary sources also provided data used in the analysis.

CHAPTER 3

NWREL/EBCE: THE EMPLOYER-BASED APPROACH

Each regional educational laboratory has proceeded under the mandate of "directed development" to evolve an experience-based career education program; however, each project possesses a distinctive approach. Based on the analysis of official records, interviews with key staff members, and secondary sources, each program has been characterized in our study according to its major emphasis. The approach of the NWREL/EBCE will be depicted in this chapter. The relationships existing between the EBCE program and the cooperating employers, the school system, and the advisory council as well as the changes that have occurred in these relationships will also be described and analyzed. Because of the structure of the EBCE program, interorganizational relations, in which organizations are the unit of analysis, are of particular significance and constitute the focus of the administrative analysis.

We now describe the approach of the NWREL/EBCE career education program and explain the relationships among the organizations participating in it by viewing them as being involved in an exchange system.

The Employer-Based Approach

The career education program developed by NWREL/EBCE parallels the original conceptualization of the employer-based model more closely than any other of the projects. The primary reason for this circumstance is that consistent with NIE guidelines for implementing EBCE, a private, nonprofit corporation, Community Experiences for Career Education $(CE)_2$ is operating the program. $(CE)_2$ is governed by a Board of Directors made up of students, employers, educators, and various public and private agency representatives. Technical assistance is provided from NWREL.

The governance mechanism established and maintained by $(CE)_2$ is similar to the one outlined originally, and then revised, by OE. That is, OE had considered and then abandoned the scheme for a competitive EBCE procurement open to consortia of employers. However, OE had not relinquished the idea of involving employer consortia.

Stalford remarks that "the contract language with the labs specifically mentioned them (e.g., 'NWREL will provide technical assistance in the formation of a consortium to operate this pilot program'). Nevertheless, with the labs contractually responsible for development of the programs through consortia developed by them, the potential for 'creating' an EBCE program by a consortium in accordance with the original conceptualization had been diminished."[1]

In January 1973, NIE had implicitly, if not officially, recognized the serious problems associated with the original governance concept, although no formal redirection was given. "The professionals were free to support governance schemes appropriate to them and the divergence of experiences and philosophies emerging was legitimized."[2] The basic issue is whether independent community-based school systems are a viable option for the educational structure of this society. EBCE programs, as well as other alternative education programs, generally are shifting towards greater integration with the public schools. The $(CE)_2$ type of organization, which is not composed exclusively of either school personnel or adult workers, may serve as a model of how linkages between the school and economic sectors can be created.

The predominance of employers on the governing board has not determined the overall approach of the $(CE)_2$ program, although the board probably exerts some influence on internal organizational operations. That is, the factor of employer dominance on the board by itself has not resulted in the program becoming literally "employer-based." It is also the case that students enrolled in EBCE spend a major portion of their time in the community, learning on employer sites that are recruited according to students' career interests. (When students are not involved in community experiences, they are based at the $(CE)_2$ learning center.) Another circumstance is that the curriculum for EBCE is limited only by the imaginative use that is made of community resources; every student project at an employer site theoretically includes work in Basic Skills, Life Skills, and Career Development. By virtue of the relatively large proportion of time students are located at employer sites; the

---

1. Charles B. Stalford, "EBCE: A Conceptual Analysis," paper written for the Career Education Program, National Institute of Education, May 1974, p. II-13.

2. Ibid., P. II-18.

extensive use that is made of these sites in connection with academic subjects as well as career development; and the preeminence of employers on the board, the NWREL/EBCE program lends itself to being described as having a distinctive employer-based orientation.

EBCE-Employer Relationships

What interrelationships exist between the educational and economic sectors in the EBCE program? Originally, OE planned an "industry-based EBCE program," then changed the conceptualization of the program to include all types of employers and other community groups as well. The interorganizational relationships between "employers," as these various types of groups are referred to in the program's official records, and the EBCE program are the foci of this analysis.

When the NWREL/EBCE program was opened to students in September 1972, program development was still incomplete and considerable improvisation relative to involving employers in the delivering of educational services was evident. Initially, each regional laboratory engaged in evolving an agreement or understanding with each cooperating employer about their respective functions in the EBCE program. Consensus about each organization's domain had to be reached. That is, the specific goals each organization wished to pursue and the activities it undertook to implement its goals had to be identified. Existing constraints on utilizing employers in an educational program also had to be identified and countervailed by NWREL/EBCE if possible.[3] The official records suggest that NWREL did not encounter the degree of hesitancy or resistance on the part of employers that some laboratories did. Records indicate that employers did not feel competent to teach basic skill subjects, but not that they felt they were being asked to assume illegitimate or inappropriate functions.[4]

The process of achieving domain consensus characterized, and still characterizes, much of the interaction between employer organizations and the EBCE program. Inasmuch as an educational service, a diffuse type of activity, is the focus of domain consensus, constant

---

3. Sol Levine and Paul E. White, "Exchange and Interorganizational Relationships," Administrative Science Quarterly, V (1961), p. 597.

4. NWREL, "FY 74 Operating Plan for the EBCE Program," July 20, 1973, p. 112.

readjustment and compromise, i.e., negotiation or bargaining on the part of the interacting organizations, are necessary.[5] For example, the procedures for extracting curriculum from employer/community sites which involved input from both these sites and the laboratory had to be specified and clarified over a period of two years. The processes leading to domain consensus are characterized by "proferring information about the availability of elements as well as about rights and obligations regarding the elements."[6] Relative to rights and responsibilities in the EBCE program, it was necessary to specify that "learning on the job site takes priority over performing productive work."[7] That is, "if the $(CE)_2$ staff or the employer or the student feels he or she is becoming productive on that learning site, a student moves to another work place."[8] The Letter of Intent signed by employers spells out in formal fashion their rights and responsibilities.

> When they become members of $(CE)_2$ by signing a Letter of Intent, they agree to make their places of business available for student exploration. They help $(CE)_2$ staff analyze the learning experiences which can be offered at their sites; they assist students in accomplishing learning objectives at their sites and they certify afterward that the student has satisfactorily completed the activities planned.[9]

It is also notable that in the process of developing the project, the boundary limits of domain consensus had to be determined deliberately by NWREL/EBCE professional staff. This is indicated by the statement in July 1973 that "selected employers will be 'pushed to the limit' in assuming instructional and guidance responsibilities with students and the effects will be documented."[10] Unfortunately, the outcome of this procedure was not mentioned in subsequent reports.

---

5. Levine and White, op. cit., p. 599.

6. Idem.

7. NWREL, "Executive Summary, FY 74 Operating Plan," July 1973, p. 6.

8. Idem.

9. Ibid., p. 5.

10. Ibid., p. 27.

The process of achieving a minimal level of domain consensus is a necessary precondition for the exchange of elements between organizations. The content of the Letter of Intent, signed by participating employers, provides information on rights and obligations regarding organizational elements and a fairly explicit and formalized agreement underlying the exchange. NWREL/EBCE has explicitly defined the terms of the agreement for all cooperating employers, rather than to involve both parties in arriving anew at the terms each time.

Although the educational purpose of the interaction between EBCE and the employers necessitates continuing and constant adjustments, the standardization and formalization of the terms of exchange mean that orientation procedures may predominate with many organizations. As EBCE has developed more experience in working with employers to maximize the educational potential of the workplace, domain consensus with "new" business organizations can be attained by orientation, that is, by providing a standard Orientation Packet, plus additional orientation materials when necessary, and having organizational representatives attend the "developmental meetings."

The number, frequency, and type of contacts with employers required by the structure of the EBCE program have resulted in an employer relations specialist being included on the staff. "The scheduling of student visitations to employer/community sites is done by the employer relations specialist according to the needs of the student and the employer. The time a student will spend at the employer/community site is planned to take into account the employer supervisor's and the student's other time commitments."[11] The contacts with employers by telephone, letters, luncheons, and site visits allow the specialist to maintain communication with the "keystones" of the program and an optimal relationship with them.

The concerns of potential adopting districts relative to the willingness of employers to participate in a long-term program and the maintenance of employer sites as learning, and not work, situations highlight problematic areas in this set of interorganizational relationships.[12] Educational systems, including specific programs,

---

11. NWREL, "FY 74 Operating Plan for the EBCE Program," July 20, 1973, p. 145.

12. NWREL, "FY 74 Third Quarterly Report," June 21, 1974, p. 15.

must provide for stability and continuity of basic elements as well as exercise control, if necessary, over cooperating organizations and the experiences and activities offered. It is too early to know with any certainty how the issue of continuity of employer relationships over an extended period of time will be resolved. When two organizations bind themselves together for a specified time and limited activities by the terms of a contract, the legally enforceable stipulations of the contract provide accountability and supervision. The legal status of the Letter of Intent and the long-term cooperation required to maintain the program raise questions about the exercise of authority that cannot be answered at present.

An important dimension of the exchange situation is the kinds and quantities of exchanges--and the motivations that prompt them. In examining this facet, NWREL remarked in July 1974 that "one key motivation for employers to become involved in EBCE is their interest in improving educational practices. $(CE)_2$ has held an intensive review with participating employers, and the resultant suggestions for improving employer participation in delivering the Basic Skills, exploration experiences, and guidance activities must be acted upon."[13] The conclusion arrived at is that if NWREL/EBCE wishes to satisfy its need for learning stations on employer sites, then it must be aware of and attempt to meet the complementary expectations of the cooperating business organizations.

EBCE - School System Interrelationships

Before the NWREL/EBCE project officially began, securing clearance from local, as well as, state educators was part of the groundwork. Upon the funding of the project in March 1972, a local planning group comprised of employers, students, Tigard School district representatives, and NWREL technical assistance team members was formed "to define the purposes, to develop the basic structure of the programs, and to identify constraints."[14]

A major characteristic of the EBCE program which evolved from these deliberations was that "the provision of a sound educational program is the responsibility of a private nonprofit corporation, subject to the approval of

---

13. NWREL, "FY 75 Operating Plan," July 1974, p. 20.

14. NWREL, "Quarterly Report," July 31, 1972, p. 2.

the Tigard School District and the Oregon Board of Education."[15] Such a private nonprofit corporation, $(CE)_2$, was formed and eleven members were appointed to the Board of Directors in 1972. Of these eleven members, one was a representative of the Tigard School District. In part, this meager representation of the local school system may reflect NIE's emphasis on establishing an alternate educational program, not under the control of the school district.

Achieving domain consensus between NWREL/EBCE and the Tigard School District, a prerequisite to the exchange relationship, appears to have been achieved by an infrequently used formalized means, specifically "the empowering, licensing, or legitimatizing' of an organization to operate with the community by some other organization."[16] In this instance, the Tigard School Board empowered the $(CE)_2$ Board of Directors to make decisions in areas relevant to program functioning that are the school district prerogatives from a legal standpoint. As stated in the FY '73 Year End Report, "program governances and policy making responsiblities rest not with a school district nor with the staff, but rather with those interested members of the Tigard community serving on the Board."[17]

In the FY 75 Operating Plan, the agreement underlying the exchange is briefly described: "$(CE)_2$ policies are determined by a 13-member Board with clearly defined relationships spelled out with the Tigard Public Schools in a formal Letter of Agreement."[18] Thus, the prior agreement is quite explicit and highly formalized.

During the first year of the program, $(CE)_2$ worked closely with the Tigard school system in coordinating student record transfers, student credentialing, and a study of community characteristics. These activities can be categorized as administrative and research in type. In the early phase of the project, the interactions with the school system focused primarily on the recruitment of students, standardization of external reporting of student achievement, and the clarification and specification of $(CE)_2$ program requirements in relation to Tigard High School graduation requirements. Thus, the EBCE program was cognizant of the general need for an effective

---

15. NWREL, "FY 73 Year End Report," September 1973, p. 4.

16. Levine and White, op. cit., p. 418.

17. NWREL, "FY 73 Year End Report," September 1973, p. 20.

18. NWREL, "FY 75 Operating Plan," July 1974, p. 12.

articulation process with educational institutions who send, and/or receive, students to the $(CE)_2$ program or who must certify and/or monitor them under the program. The school district was kept informed throughout each year of the planning for the subsequent year and informal discussions regarding the questions surrounding $(CE)_2$ continuance beyond developmental funding were held.

In response to a question from this writer about changes in the type of issues discussed with the school system since the program got under way, an NWREL staff member commented: "The basic shift is from community understanding of the nature and acceptance of what we're trying to do to a focus on how to continue the program. It's changed from a discussion of basic problems about student matters--behavior [and] transfers to increasing the Tigard staff's understanding of the program as it's gone from small to large." This description of the alteration is reflected in the project's official records. After the development of a prospectus on program replication by each lab in November 1973, the emphasis on development strategies and procedures for continuing the program gradually increased in the NWREL/EBCE documents.

In early 1974, in response to the request by NIE for a formal agreement by June 1, 1974, specifying the future relationship between the Tigard school system and $(CE)_2$, a committee was formed to identify and explore existing alternatives.[19] The committee represented a cross-section of people acting in the interest of $(CE)_2$, the community, and the Tigard School District administration. "The final recommendation was that $(CE)_2$ continue as a private nonprofit corporation to provide a total alternative education to students interested in EBCE and that the district contract with $(CE)_2$ for such services."[20] Tigard school officials planned to recommend financial and operational parameters in late 1974 for consideration by the Tigard board. No further information on the outcome of the deliberations of the Tigard board is available in the records. It is noted, however, that the maintenance of a separate governance system, which characterizes the agreed-upon program structure, will produce very detailed information on legal issues and relationships between the public school and a specialized educational contractor. In short, questions about organizational interrelationships that are now problematic can be studied and resolved.

---

19. NWREL, "FY 1974 Third Quarterly Report," June 21, 1974, p. 13.

20. Ibid., p. 14.

At present, as NWREL plans with $(CE)_2$ and the Tigard schools for the use of $(CE)_2$ as a demonstration and training center for interested users, increased interaction with the Tigard School District has occurred. As a consequence, one-half time teacher liaison person has been named by the school system. The number of meetings between the $(CE)_2$ Director and the Tigard superintendent's office as well as the school district board of trustees has also increased. In effect, the issue of domain consensus has implicitly been raised again and readjustments and compromises must take place. It is clear that the negotiation of domain consensus, prior to the further exchange of elements, is more complicated than previous bargaining was and has lead to the addition of a specialist concerned with this set of interrelationships.

From the inception of the program, on the satisfactory completion of $(CE)_2$ program requirements, graduating students receive a regular high school diploma and join their class at Tigard High School for commencement. (The acknowledgment of completion of the $(CE)_2$ program is approved by the Oregon State Board of Education.) This circumstance underscores the high degree of dependence of NWREL/EBCE on the Tigard school system for its clients, the sine qua non of the program.

EBCE - Advisory Board Relationship

The establishment of the Advisory Board and the specification of its functions were congruent with the general EBCE goal "to develop, test, and document a governance system which places educational management decisions in the hands of people who directly and consciously represent the roles of employer, laborer, student, and parent."[21] In April 1972, shortly after the project was funded, a local planning group composed of employers, students, Tigard School District representatives, and NWREL technical assistance team members was established to work on defining the purposes of the project, developing its program structure, and identifying constraints. In July 1972, Community Experiences for Career Education, $(CE)_2$ was designated by the planning group as the name of the program. During August, $(CE)_2$ was incorporated and the selection of the Consortium Board of Directors was made. The initial Board of Directors was composed of one student, one parent, one Tigard School District representative, six employers, one labor representative, and one

---

21. Cited in NWREL, "EBCE Executive Summary FY 74 Operating Plan," July 1973, p. 5.

member at large. At its first meeting, the Board approved the Bylaws that had been drawn up, approved the subcontract between $(CE)_2$ and NWREL, and elected officers.[22]

Few organizations have sufficient access to elements such as clients, resources, or funds so that they completely attain their goals. Under realistic conditions of the scarcity of such factors, organizations must select particular sets of interrelated services or activities that permit them to achieve their ends as fully as possible. At its inception, the Board was responsible for the hiring of on-site staff members, determining policies, and setting procedures--all with NWREL technical assistance.[23] A Research and Development (R & D) staff or support team at NWREL provided such services as curriculum development, evaluation, documentation, and accounting. Two R & D staff members were located on-site in Tigard to directly supplement and document operation activities, one assisting the Learning Manager, and the other helping to provide liaison with employers and community resources. Initially, the Board of Directors met five times each quarter. Some areas in which decision-making that specified the content of policy determination occurred were: adoption of bylaws, election of new members, authorization of financial resolutions, insurance coverage, approval of the subcontract with NWREL, adoption of a student accountability system, the vacation schedule, graduation requirements, determination of curriculum, and strategies of engendering employer support.[24]

The problems encountered in establishing and developing the consortium were: (1) the Board's need for a broader understanding of the nature of R & D as opposed to operation, and (2) its need for more information about the complexities of the instructional system.[25]

In the FY 74 Operating Plan, it is noted that "the Board began with some questions but has developed into a cohesive unit with a pervasive influence on the program's

---

22. NWREL, "Quarterly Report to USOE," July 31, 1972, pp. 3-5.

23. NWERL, "EBCE Suburban-Rural Pilot Program Quarterly Report to USOE," January 31, 1973, p. 6.

24. Ibid., p. 7.

25. Idem.

day-to-day functioning."[26] That is, of course, consistent with our earlier statement that a board in most instances exercises influence on internal organizational operations, whether or not they intend to do so, and on establishing or approving the primary objective of the organization.

The FY 73 Year End Report remarks that "the operational successes of the NWREL/EBCE model can be attributed to the establishment of an autonomous corporation governed by an elected Board of Directors for program governance and policy, making responsibility rest not with a school district nor with the staff, but rather with those interested members of the Tigard community serving on the Board. Students and staff are accountable to the corporation, just as the corporation is responsible for them and the program."[27]

During the next two years, the Board introduced some changes in its composition, activities, and emphasis which reflected the developing expertise it has acquired in operating an alternative educational program. Specifically, the Board in November 1973 increased the number of labor representatives from one to three to counterbalance any impression of favoring "business." Second, during the second quarter of FY 74, it assumed total responsibility for all $(CE)_2$ employees. The staff had previously been NWREL employees on loan to the system. Finally, a committee to study the future relationships between $(CE)_2$ and the Tigard School District was officially established. In June 1973 it was noted that "as the second operational year draws to a close for $(CE)_2$, the independent Board of Directors is functioning effectively."[28]

In considering the issue of program replication, the Board commissioned two projects. The first was a study of the costs of student participation on employer sites. The findings were that employers were making substantial contributions, in fiscal terms, to the education of $(CE)_2$ students. The second, a small scale study of possible alternative program configurations, was utilized by the joint committee studying the long-range future of $(CE)_2$.

---

26. NWREL, "EBCE Executive Summary, FY 74 Operating Plan," July 1973, p. 13.

27. NWREL, "FY 73 Year End Report," September 1973, p. 20.

28. NWREL, "FY 74 Third Quarterly Report," June 21, 1974, p. 3.

NIE had requested that a formal agreement be ratified by June 1, 1974, specifying the future relationship between the Tigard School District and $(CE)_2$. The joint $(CE)_2$-Tigard School Committee recommended that $(CE)_2$ continue as a private nonprofit organization to furnish a a total alternative education to students interested in EBCE and that the district contract with $(CE)_2$ for such services. All the problematic issues in this governance arrangement are not yet known, nor their possible solutions. Currently, the major thrust of $(CE)_2$'s Board is planning with the Tigard schools for the use of $(CE)_2$ as a demonstration and training center.

Because the $(CE)_2$ Board has played an active role in the program's activities, it has served more to link the organization to the community and its elements than to tie EBCE to other educational organizations. For this reason, governance as an essential part of the implementation process has been one of the earliest of the program elements to be stabilized.

CHAPTER 4

FWL/EBCE: THE CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT EMPHASIS

The Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development was one of two regional laboratories that conducted a feasibility study of Employer-Based Career Education from June to December 1971. The three phases of this feasibility study with their corresponding shifts in focus are described in the official records of the project. In Phase I, "The original purpose of the feasibility study was to provide a comprehensive systems analysis of all the parameters relevant to developing an EBCE model. The aim was to assist RFP writers, proposal writers, and successful bidders. Therefore, we explored various facets of each topic and considered various forms that EBCE might take."[1] During Phase II, OE recommended that the task for implementers of EBCE be simplified by FWL's "moving into advanced design, i.e., not merely examining possible configurations that might be incorporated in EBCE, but actually designing features that would be put into practice."[2] When the third phase evolved, the RFP strategy was discarded three and a half months after the letting of the contract, and "[FWL] was asked to develop and later to implement a specific pilot program."[3] The assessment of this early experience was that "despite these changes in course and readjustments, the studies yielded a good deal of valuable information . . . "[4]

What is the distinguishing emphasis of one of the long-term participants in the EBCE program? Did the "valuable information" acquired during the feasibility study have any effect on FWL/EBCE's subsequent development? What type of relationships have been established between the EBCE program and cooperating employers, the school system, and the Policy Advisory Board, and how have they changed over time? In short, what is the nature and extent of the interorganizational relationships that characterize the FWL/EBCE program?

---

1. FWL, "Year-End Report FY 1973," September 28, 1973, p. 8.
2. Idem.
3. Ibid., p. 9.
4. Idem.

The Curriculum Development Emphasis

The emphasis on curriculum development that characterizes the EBCE program developed by FWL was reflected in its assessment of the outcomes of the feasibility study:

> Our feasibility study concluded that a program as dynamic as EBCE - committed to individual growth, learning in the real world, adapting curriculum to the merging of academic and work experience - would be steering an uncharted course, and therefore should not be bound by preconceived commitments to organizational structure or methods. It recommended flexible differentiated staffing, a system of organically related processes rather than a static linear curriculum, and that the traditional notion of teacher be abandoned in favor of the newer role of facilitator or enabler.[5]

Notably, the project was aware that adapting curricula for the articulation of academic and work experiences involved "steering an uncharted course." In fact, this orientation necessitated such extensive adaptation of materials that a new curriculum was being developed, which utilized "a system of organically related processes." In an early report, FWL/EBCE's approach was made explicit:

> Out of our pre-pilot experience with territories and resource persons we have developed the concept of emerging curriculum -- as opposed to an a priori or presented one. Emerging curriculum is a reversal of the traditional approach that begins with a set of pre-existing goals and objectives then looks for materials that can realize them. Our approach begins with two organization centers: 1) The goals and interests of students, and 2) what learning territories have to offer. It is a set of procedures for identifying what opportunities exist in the community, analyzing them in terms of student learning needs, then devising ways to take advantage of them. In other words, we begin with the environment, real-life situations, determine what students can get out of them, then build a program of goals and activities that match the two.[6]

---

5. FWL, "FWL EBCE Model: Accomplishments to Date," July 31, 1972, p. 7.

6. Ibid., pp. 15-16.

Curricular considerations of the most fundamental kind were involved. "It was (and is) an acknowledged fact that the most important single factor in determining curricular content is the textbook."[7] Even though FWL/EBCE's orientation reversed the usual approach, which by definition precluded the writing of a textbook, the development of "learning packages" was emphasized. "A package is an assemblage of RP's, LEO's, and supplementary resources organized in terms of a common set of learning outcomes, related to a 'subject area' and careers associated with it. The organizing principle may be a genuine career area . . . or it may be a competence or subject area . . . satisfying both Oakland graduate requirements as well as student interests."[8]

The learning packages are the functional equivalent of a textbook exhibiting a total curriculum that would be recognizably superior to career education materials already in existence. FWL/EBCE's strategy would allow school administrators and teachers to approve and adopt it as a satisfactory innovation or replacement, developed by a reputable educational organization. The official records indicate that considerable effort has been expended throughout the EBCE project on developing and revising the learning packages so that influence on experience-based career education could be exerted through the voluntary acceptance of the merit of the finished product.

EBCE - Employer Relationships

As part of the feasibility study, a stakeholder analysis based on interviews with employers was carried out. Some of the major misgivings about the EBCE concept which employers expressed were:

1. Business and industry are not equipped to educate; they are not academicians.

2. EBCE would cause a rift between business and education, and the students' education would suffer.

3. The program would be too costly.

---

7. William Wooton, SMSG: The Making of a Curriculum (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965).

8. FWL, "Year-End Report FY 1973," September 28, 1973, p. 26.

4. Employers' training centers are already "doing the job."

5. Why should employers do what educators are paid to do?

6. Employers are in business to make a profit. EBCE offers no economic advantages.

7. Labor unions will be a problem. They are unqualified to educate, but will make trouble if they're excluded.[9]

These results sensitized FWL/EBCE, as well as the other regional laboratories participating in the program, to the reservations and doubts that would have to be countervailed.

Another substudy conducted by FWL included interviews with over a hundred employers at 37 different occupational locations about learning in occupational settings. From these site visits and interviews, it was concluded that:

1. Learning can definitely occur in occupational settings, but to meet all the desired objectives requires involving at least a dozen employers in the program.

2. Facilities other than employer settings must be utilized, such as a resource center, to insure that basic academic skills are acquired.

3. Contexts outside the work setting -- libraries, museums, court houses, etc. -- must be fully utilized as part of the model.[10]

These two projects, it appears from the official records, influenced substantially the evolution of the particular approach and procedures that would characterize the FWL/EBCE program.

Initially, to overcome employer resistance to, and reservations about, the project, FWL/EBCE instituted a public relations campaign which utilized group presentations, press releases, brochure materials, and personal

---

9. FWL, "FWL EBCE Model: Accomplishments to Date," July 31, 1972, p. 2.

10. Ibid., p. 4.

interviews "to dispel misconceptions and educate employers about the real nature of EBCE. We are stressing the fact that employers are not asked to become academicians, step out of their depth, etc., and are spelling out precisely what their involvement would consist of."[11] From an organizational perspective, these activities were designed to facilitate the process of achieving domain consensus between EBCE and prospective cooperating employers. In effect, they were necessary preconditions for the exchange of elements between them.

The signing of a joint agreement with the Oakland Public Schools, establishing EBCE as an alternative school in the district, at approximately the same time as the public relations campaign mentioned above, was particularly important in a symbolical way to the business community. This agreement provided evidence to employers of local public school system support for this new educational venture, and also decreased or removed active opposition to the project.

Applying the conclusions of substudies conducted during the feasibility phase, the FWL/EBCE model, as of August 30, 1972, focused on territories and resource persons. A territory was defined as "any place where learning can occur." Two kinds were identified: (1) "a learning territory is any place where people work, for pay or as volunteers, and where at least one person is willing and able to share some of his experiences, knowledge, skills and interests with a student; and (2) community resources are facilities -- usually public, like museums, parks, libraries, court houses--where learning can occur but that do not necessarily require resource persons or prearrangements. The resource person has become one of the focal points of our developmental process, first because it is through his seasoned knowledge of the workaday world that rich learning activities are generated, and second, because one of our key assumptions is that motivation (which is essential to learning) often develops out of a relationship between people."[12]

This emphasis, with some modifications, continues throughout the development and elaboration of the FWL/EBCE model. Of particular importance is the resource person, whose role definition has remained stable and whose function in connection with motivating learning has had significance for the type of relationships developed

---

11. Ibid., p. 10.

12. Ibid., p. 12.

with employer organizations. In September 1973, FWL stated that in addition to the resource persons, "other opportunities result from the student's on-site interactions with employer organizations per se, in which students receive preplanned orientation briefings and engage in observation and study of operations within the organization as well as direct hands-on experience. These are called Large Employer Organizations (LEOs). The primary learning resources--RPs and LEOs--are supplemented by more conventional instructional resources such as textbooks, tutorials, and workshops."[13]

During the first year, the addition of LEO's as a class of learning resources represented a major change in the program. The five LEO's which were available to students were selected partly on the basis of the variety of occupations represented within the organizations. FWL/EBCE planned to develop one more LEO by August 1973. From that point on, it cannot be determined from the records the number of additional LEO's, if any, that have participated in the program. The emphasis on the utilization of RP's and relationships between a student and an individual working-adult in the FWL/EBCE model is notable and has consequences for the analysis of the interorganizational relations between the program and employer organizations. The analysis is based on a small number of organizations, however, so that its generalizability is limited. Also, the procedures and policies relative to LEO's that were applicable during the pilot test are described in detail in the records, but subsequent changes and the reasons for them are not. The tentativeness of the analysis of this set of interorganizational relationships is further underscored.

Unlike the structure of their relationships within the other regional laboratories, the employer organizations in FWL/EBCE have a dual relationship to the EBCE program: as cooperating employers, and as members of the Policy Advisory Board. From one perspective, this arrangement probably facilitates the establishment of domain consensus; that is, consensus on the specific goals each organization wishes to pursue and the functions it undertakes in order to implement its goals.[14] From the opposite approach, this strategy has limitations for EBCE programs that

---

13. FWL, "Year-End Report FY 1973," September 28, 1973, p. 12.

14. Sol Levine and Paul E. White, "Exchange and Interorganizational Relationships," Administrative Science Quarterly, V (1961), p. 597.

stress the involvement of employer organizations, rather than individual workers, since including every participating employer on the advisory board would be impossible.

It is also interesting to note that in the 1972-73 contract, NIE included the following requirement as a technical term and condition to be met by September 1, 1972: "Draft and use written agreements concerning laboratory and employer commitments."[15] This is, of course, an illustration of the strategy of directed development employed by NIE, but it could also indicate that FWL's stress on student relationships with individual working-adults could have resulted in their utilizing less formalized arrangements.

Revising the framework of the EBCE program to include LEO's in the first year lead to these priorities for development during the second year: expanding the number and use of LEO's in the EBCE curriculum; defining the role of LEO's in the model; and stabilizing and testing procedures for LEO development and use.[16] As a necessary prerequisite to achieving domain consensus, the incentives for LEO's were to be clearly spelled out in brochures describing the program. Specifically, they were identified as: "1. An improved process of career choices insures better employees; 2. employees develop a more enjoyable and broader view of their job by interacting with students; and, 3. the morale of LEO employees and their understanding of the work organization is improved in working with students."[17]

In Chapter 3, we noted that when the functions of the interacting organizations are diffuse, as is the case with an educational program, achieving domain consensus becomes a matter of constant readjustment and compromise, a process which may be called negotiation or bargaining. The procedures by which LEO's were "developed," following their recruitment, illustrates this process.

> . . . the development of learning activities is either carried out by LEO employees with guidance from FWS, or accomplished by the FWS curriculum developer with some guidance from the LEO (usually the program coordinator).

---

15. FWL, "Year-End Report FY 1973," September 28, 1972, p. 4.

16. FWL, "FWL Operating Plan FY 1974-Executive Summary," p. 19.

17. FWL, "FWL Operating Plan FY 1974," p. 45.

> If the LEO wants to develop the learning activities, the FWS developer must carefully review all suggested activities and offer helpful revisions before the students participate. We prefer to have the curriculum developers design the activities, with close guidance from the LEO, because they are more skilled than the LEO representatives at determining learning activities students enjoy.
>
> Together the developer and the program coordinator identify areas in the LEO where learning activities will be developed. Once these have been identified, the curriculum developer meets individually, or in small groups, with representatives of the divisions where the students will be. Meetings are held with division managers, who then provide an introduction to individual employees. These two groups are also given a personal explanation of the program, an accounting of the activities the students will be pursuing, their purposes, and anticipated outcome. It is explained very clearly that the purposes are not training but exploration, that the students are not employees but visitors, and that the students are not being paid.[18]

During this period, the developer frequently visits and phones the LEO to prepare and schedule the activities as well as to solve any problems that have arisen. Following a pilot test, in which a small group of students participate from 20 to 50 hours over a one- to two-week period, the curriculum developer meets with the LEO coordinator to discuss the outcomes and to arrange for further development and later student involvement. It should be noted that changes are made only with the concurrence of the coordinator. "The final written description of the LEO contains learning objectives and specific information about the learning activities. A starting date for LEO activities is set in advance and a list of participating students is given to the program coordinator."[19]

It has been remarked that "once an organization's goals are accepted, domain consensus continues as long as the organization fulfills the functions adjudged appropriate to its goals and adheres to certain standards of

---

18. Ibid., p. 47.

19. Ibid., p. 54.

quality."[20] In a bureaucratic organization, authority must be delegated to a position to handle problems effectively. In interorganizational relationships delegation is largely lateral rather than vertical, and voluntary rather than mandatory. The method of supervision outlined for use by LEO's may or may not be recommended for the model, depending on the outcome of additional experience with it. It is described as follows:

> The LEO program coordinator normally supervises the employees' work with students, but the supervision is of a casual nature. Employees are given direction on how to interact with students and then left to their own resources. The program coordinator interacts periodically with the staff to find out how the activities are working and suggests revisions based on the evaluation of the activities by the Far West School . . . We do not believe it will be necessary or cost effective for FWS staff to directly supervise learning activities in LEOs.[21]

The structure and goals of the EBCE program necessitate such a high level of dependency on employers that it bears repeating that employer organizations are the keystone of the program. The emphasis within the FWL/EBCE model is, however, on relationships with individual working-adults (RP's) rather than LEO's. This emphasis results in less dependence on collectivities, as opposed to individuals, for one element vital to the program. It offers an important alternative strategy that recognizes and resolves the problematic aspect of interorganizational relations between the educational and economic sectors.

EBCE - School System Relationships

During the second quarter of 1972, FWL signed a joint agreement with the Oakland Public Schools, which instituted the EBCE program as an alternative school in their district. FWL commented, at the time, on the importance of this collaboration in securing the cooperation of employers in the community, because of the close association which had existed between the school system and business. Whether one or both parties were actively

---

20. Levine and White, op. cit., p. 597.

21. FWL, "FWL Operating Plan FY 1974," p. 54.

involved in arriving at the terms of the agreement cannot be determined from the records. However, the agreement underlying the exchange that would occur between the EBCE program and the school district was not only explicit and formalized, but apparently had symbolic significance to prospective participating employers as well.

One of the seven basic requirements for the EBCE program was that control over it was to be outside the regular public schools. In this connection, a technical term and condition for FWL/EBCE that was specified by the NIE was:

> Carefully reconsider the Laboratory's association with the Oakland Public Schools and provide convincing assurances that control of the model does not lie in the hands of school administrators.[22]

NIE adjudged that this condition had been satisfactorily met by the deadline of September 1, 1972.

While the funding agency was persuaded that the FWL/EBCE program was not dominated by the local school district, the project was nonetheless highly dependent on it. The FY 74 Operating Plan notes that "policy is currently determined by FWL within constraints imposed by NIE. The Superintendent's Office of the Oakland Public Schools participates with the Laboratory in determining policy toward student recruitment and to translation of credits toward the diploma."[23] Establishing and implementing policy in these two areas is, of course, vital to insuring the success of the program. They have been a continuing concern of FWL/EBCE and the school system since the program started and considerable time and effort has been expended on identifying and resolving the issues related to them.

In the first year of the program, the pool of volunteer students was randomly selected from all applicants from six Oakland Public High Schools. "After this random selection, they [were] paper screened in order to obtain a group consideration for final selection. Paper screening at this stage [was] to insure a student representation similar to that of Oakland Public Schools based on the

---

22. FWL, "Year-End Report FY 1973," September 28, 1973, p. 4.

23. FWL, "Operating Plan, FY 1974," p. 28.

following criteria: 1) sex, 2) ethnic group, 3) future plans for formal education, and 4) grade level. A fifth factor which will be considered is SES."[24] The Selection Committee included five members; of these, one was a representative of the Oakland Public Schools.

By March 1974, peer recruitment of new candidates was agreed upon as the most effective and least costly procedure. "Current FWL students will recruit prospective applicants at local high schools and junior high schools in coordination with OPS counseling and administrative staff. Posters and school newsletters will be used to alert applicants."[25] In June 1974, the interest in and support for the EBCE program by the district superintendent, regional superintendents, and central administration was characterized as "continuing to be high." However, "support from some high school principals appears to be tenuous, probably because of declining enrollment at Oakland's senior high schools."[26] The FY 74 Year-End Report remarks that experimental and control group recruitment and selection were accomplished by the joint effort of FWL and OPS staffs. Regardless of the method of recruiting students, the school district has always been involved to a greater or lesser extent. The effect of the decline in student enrollment in the sending buildings on the attitudes of principals towards the EBCE program indicates the significance of external factors in program developments and highlights the dependency of the program on the school system.

In connection with the granting of course credits, the FY 74 Operating Plan mentions that "the plan has been jointly developed by OPS counselors, administrators, and FWS staff for translating FWS students' activities and credits to equivalent OPS 'units' and 'courses.' A record of the educational activities and credits is kept for each student at FWS. Their converted OPS unit and course equivalency is forwarded to the appropriate high school."[27] During 1973-74, an Operations Task Force comprised of OPS staff, representatives of participating employers and the community, and FWS staff was to be established. The mandate to this Task Force included

---

24. FWL, "Quarterly Report," September 30, 1972, p. 3.

25. FWL, "Second Quarterly Reprot FY 1974," March 15, 1974, p. 3.

26. FWL, "Third Quarterly Report FY 1974," p. 32.

27. FWL, "Operating Plan FY 1974," p. 32.

"an analysis of the student credit assignment procedure now employed with recommendations for revisions and modifications."[28]

By March 1974, the three OPS Regional Superintendents had agreed to a new student credit procedure. Of particular interest is the fact that it used "a combined performance and time-based system, in which productive hours spent and quality of work performed are assessed in conjunction."[29] A Credit Assignment Committee composed of the Director of Operations, the OPS liaison officer, three learning coordinators and the skills specialist, was responsible for implementing the procedure. "The Committee agreed that the approach was efficient, liked by the students, approved by the district, and is a good one for a performance-based program such as EBCE."[30]

Two issues unique to the FWL site--dual enrollment and average daily attendance funds--illustrate the need for continuing discussions about domain consensus and the rights and responsibilities of the cooperating organizations. Dual enrollment signifies that each FWS students registers at an OPS high school and receives his diploma from it. The problem concerns the fact that "OPS has established graduation requirements for the district; however, each of the six high schools exercises considerable flexibility in interpreting the district requirements and several have added additional course requirements."[31] Thus, six sets of graduate requirements are in effect at FWS. As a result, additional instructional and administrative burdens are placed on FWS and their program efforts are constrained by six different equivalency schedules. FWS notes that "while it is possible to maintain this relationship, it is a less than desirable one. The best short-range alternative would be to obtain agreement from several schools to graduate FWS students who meet the district-set minimum requirements."[32] Whether or not the proposed solution was implemented is never mentioned in the project's records.

---

28. Ibid., p. 35.

29. FWL, "Second Quarterly Report FY 1974," March 15, 1974, p. 4.

30. Ibid., p. 5.

31. FWL, "Operating Plan FY 1974," p. 34.

32. Idem.

A request forwarded to the California State Department of Education by the OPS for authorization to receive daily attendance funds for OPS/FWS students raised the issue of double funding, i.e., funds from the federal government (NIE) and funds from the state for the OPS/FWS enrollees. FWL commented that "while OPS incurs fewer costs for FWS students than for its regular full-time students, its expenditures are significant nevertheless... FWS anticipates an enrollment of 50 students for the 1973-74 school year. This represents $55,000 in state funds which OPS seeks and which is a strong incentive for them to continue participating."[33] The request was supported by the FWS staff, but the State's decision is not mentioned in subsequent reports.

Levine and White found that "the organization's function establishes the range of possibilities for exchange and that other variables exert influence within the framework established by function."[34] One such variable is prestige. That is, the organizational purposes of FWL/EBCE and the local school system provide the limits for interorganizational relationships; prestige may have some affect on interaction patterns within those boundaries. FWL/EBCE has seemed to be particularly aware of this factor, and to have enhanced the relative status of its program in order to increase the number of referrals and amount of resources.

Because FWS operates as an adjunct of OPS, accreditation is not a problem. Students retain their status at one of six OPS high schools and all of these schools are accredited. FWS could offer its own diploma, but it would not have the same status as an OPS diploma since FWL/EBCE does not have its own accreditation in California. One additional part of the mandate to the Operations Task Force in 1973-74 was to analyze problems and benefits associated with FWS accreditation, and make recommendations to the OPS School Board and the FWS Advisory Board. The outcome of the Task Force's efforts is not mentioned in later reports.

Concern for the program's prestige probably also motivated the effort to insure that FWL/EBCE operated without state and local waivers. In September 1972, a

---

33. Idem.

34. Levine and White, op. cit., p. 597.

report commented that "the curriculum of this program does not meet all SDE and OPS requirements."[35] In the FY 74 Operating Plan, the following statement appears:

> We do not intend to seek waivers from either credentialing or academic requirements . . . We intend to develop and maintain standards that will make this program both acceptable and replicable in other places without the need for waiver.[36]

The effect of this strategy on subsequent relationships with other organizations cannot be determined from the records.

As was pointed out in the previous chapter, the clarification of organizational domains and the development of domain consensus contribute to the solution of the problem of "who gets what for what purpose." In brief, domain consensus is a prerequisite to exchange. The agreement underlying the exchange may be implicit or explicit, informal or formal. In the FY 74 Operating Plan, more information is available on the specific arrangements between the EBCE program and the Oakland School District. "A major accomplishement was a signed agreement between the FWL and the OPS, spelling out the purpose and the role of the EBCE program with the OPS system."[37] It is also noted that "funding of this total program and contractual agreements with OPS and other agencies is the legal and administrative responsibility of the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development. Personnel, finance, and administrative policies set for the Laboratory also govern the EBCE funds received from NIE. OPS provides educational services, including various instructional texts, forms, and staff time required to meet their informational needs."[38] In June 1974, it is noted in connection with replication activities that "the cabinet, consisting of OPS central office staff and FWL management, has met both formally and informally. Informal agreement or approval for continuation of EBCE during 1974-75 has been given. Although a formal agreement between the district and FWS

---

35. FWL, "Quarterly Report," September 30, 1972, p. 11.

36. FWL, "Operating Plan FY 1974," p. 36.

37. Ibid., p. 38.

38. Ibid., p. 38.

cannot be adopted (agreements committing the district beyond the current year are not legally binding), interest and support from the district superintendent, regional superintendents, and central office staff continue to be high."[39]

Thus, the formal agreements have specified the parties to the exchange, the kinds and quantities of elements exchanged, including clients, labor services, and resources other than labor services, and rights and obligations regarding them. The records suggest that the annual extension of the agreement has never been taken for granted and that administrative backing and interest have to be maintained, not assumed.

One mechanism for sustaining support is the Policy Advisory Board, which was established during the 1972-73 school year. Its functions were to establish policy in such areas as educational purpose and philosophy, roles and relationships with the regular public high school, student admission, student discipline and dismissal, EBCE graduate requirements, and incentives to participating individuals and organizations. The public schools are represented on the Policy Advisory Board. Initially, FWL planned to exercise control over the pilot program, then transfer its authority to a legally constituted organization of public and private employers as soon as practicable. The original target date for this transfer was February 1, 1973. The FY 74 Operating Plan noted that:

> A high priority need is to shift responsibility for the determining of operating policy from the Laboratory to the employer community, together with organized labor and the public schools. The Policy Advisory Board is intended to be the principal mechanism for achieving this transfer of policy responsibility, but the Board has yet to shift its role from passive review and consent to active planning and policy control.[40]

It is clear that FWL was committed to employers exerting the major influence on policy statements and plans, although organized labor, the public schools, students and parents were to have input as well. The authority

---

39. FWL, "Third Quarterly Report FY 1974," June 20, 1974, p. 9.

40. FWL, "Operating Plan, FY 1974," p. 29.

to sanction FWL's actions relative to Policy Advisory Board decisions was allocated to the school system or NIE. The inclusion of the school system indicates that regardless of the composition of the Policy Advisory Board--and the restricted representation of the school district--it actually exercised considerable influence and power over the operation of FWL/EBCE. Relative to the Board's authority, the FY 1974 Operating Plan states that:

> Although the Board will not have direct authority to deny management use of funds or the authority to fine management, members can protest a management decision or action by resigning from the Board and filing a protest with the Oakland Public Schools or NIE.[41]

The objectives for the Policy Advisory Board in FY 74 were to organize the Board and to elect officers no later than the September Board meeting. Standing committees were to be formed, then to give concentrated and continuing attention to such issues as educational purposes and goals and relationships with the public school. Again, the pivotal importance of relations with the local school district are highlighted.

Throughout the records of FWL/EBCE, there is an emphasis on policy statements and plans being primarily determined by employers. Yet in the FY 74 Operating Plan, it was remarked that "continued OPS support is essential, a first-priority item. To resolve it and other needs, an Operations Task Force will be created. Its membership will include OPS people, representatives from participating employers and the committee, as well as FWS staff."[42] This group met periodically throughout the 1973-74 school year and focused its efforts on curriculum, credit transfer, accreditation, communication, and other concerns.

The Operations Task Force was a group established on a short-term basis to solve specific problems impinging on the relationship between FWL/EBCE and the participating school system. The reasons for its formation suggest that the EBCE program was and is highly dependent on the school system from which it recruits its participating students. Without school district cooperation and pro-

---

41. Ibid., p. 30.

42. Ibid., p. 35.

vision of access to potential clients, FWL/EBCE cannot exist. Once issues of relationship with the schools are settled, the major liaison of concern to the EBCE program is with cooperating employers.

EBCE - Policy Advisory Board Relationships

The interrelationships between the FWL/EBCE program and its Policy Advisory Board reflect the changes in policy toward governance which were permitted or accepted by NIE. The initial guidelines issued by the Career Education Program required that control of each EBCE project be transferred as soon as it was feasible to a legal entity of public and private employers. Originally, the target date for this transfer at FWL was, as we noted earlier, February 1, 1973.

The composition, functions, and interorganizational relationships of the first advisory board established by the program are difficult to determine from the records. No current staff members that were interviewed had been associated with the project at that time. In the FY 74 Operating Plan, some historical perspective on this area of the program, however, is presented.

> In December 1971, a small advisory committee was formed through the Northern California Industry-Education Council to provide guidance in establishing the pilot program. The committee which met periodically during the spring of 1972, was composed of representatives of selected Bay Area organizations . . . They reviewed the original design of the program and pointed out various political and management problems associated with implementation and gave their general endorsement to the EBCE program conceived by Far West. The major outcome of the activities of the committee was the decision to locate the pilot program in Oakland.[43]

Apparently, this committee was disbanded after the pilot program was organized and underway. Consonant with NIE's strategy, an Advisory Board, representing the employers (profit, nonprofit, public, private) was appointed on July 20, 1972. The members were divided into groups that focused on governance, community relations, and insuring the relevance of the EBCE curriculum to the real world.

---

43. Ibid., p. 28.

In this manner, it was anticipated the Board would acquire familiarity with and proficiency in dealing with important issues relevant to the functioning of the program. By September 1973, control had not been transferred to the employer consortium as planned. It is noted that:

> We judged such transfer to be neither practicable nor desirable for these reasons: (1) Although local employers have expressed enthusiasm for the EBCE concept and have contributed heavily to its implementation, they are reluctant to accept direct responsibility for its development and operation; (2) we believe that the priority requirements of research and development can best be served if control of the pilot program remains in the hands of the developers. Concurrence with this position was requested from NIE in a request for waiver.[44]

At this point, it seems likely that NIE reconsidered its position on the governance of the EBCE programs and permitted the regional laboratory to develop it in the way that would be most effective for the program, without issuing any revised official guidelines. One FWL staff member provided an additional insight about the composition and purpose of this Advisory Board: "The initial board was primarily male and white and may have been staffed to get students into [employer] organizations."

Given more latitude to evolve an appropriate governance structure, FWL encouraged the continued membership of most employers on the board, but also added representatives from the unions, the Oakland City Council, and the Oakland Public Schools. The FY 74 Operating Plan remarks that the Policy Advisory Board, the new designation for the governing committee, was formed in January 1973. On this Advisory Board were nine members, seven of whom represented businesses or unions. The first meeting of the Board was held on May 9, 1973.[45]

During the next two years, FWL attempted to develop an effective and efficient governance structure for the program that was consistent with its distinctive approach and that included a genuine policy-governing board. Their objective was "to have policy statements and plans generated by a group of people whose educational priorities,

---

44. FWL, "Year-End Report FY 1973," September 28, 1973, p. 15.

45. FWL, "Operating Plan FY 1974," p. 28.

attitudes, and philosophy reflect those of the local community."[46] Progress toward this goal was effected slowly and not without encountering obstacles, and discarding plans and procedures. However, FWL/EBCE viewed this "cooperative sharing of policy-making responsibility as essential to the long-term viability of of EBCE."

The functions of the Policy Advisory Board have undergone little, if any, change since they were first formulated in 1973. They are:

1. To establish policy in such areas as educational purpose and philosophy, roles and relationships with the regular public high schools, student admission, student discipline and dismissal, EBCE graduate requirements, and incentives to participating individuals and organizations.

2. To review operating and evaluation plans and procedures to ensure compliance with policy.

3. To review school operations and progress relative to stated educational purpose and philosophy.

4. To develop plans for operation and support of the program after completion of the current research and development phase.

5. To represent the program to the community and to assist in obtaining commitments of additional needed resources.[47]

In the FY 74 Operating Plan, FWL gave high priority to shifting responsibility for determining operating policy from it to the employer community, together with organized labor and the public schools. The Policy Advisory Board, of course, was intended to be "the principal mechanism for achieving this transfer of policy responsibility, but the Board [had] yet to shift its role from passive review and consent to active planning and policy control."[48] In part to bring about the desired

---

46. Ibid., p. 30.

47. FWL, "Year-End Report FY 1973," September 28, 1973, p. 15.

48. FWL, "Operating Plan, FY 1974," p. 29.

shift in role, four standing committees were formed: Operations, Evaluation, Instructional Resources, and Institutional Form. These committees can recommend changes in the FWL/EBCE program to insure its eventual acceptance and adoption by other communities as well as Oakland. At the least, the Board's deliberations would yield insight into the dimensions of EBCE that are critical to issues of transportability.

The strategy for achieving active Board participation, without fiscal control, was to require it to advise and to assist program management in setting general operating priorities and in resolving any conflicts between developmental and operational priorities. The Board would also review and approve all major development and operations plans. To insure that it functioned as a genuine policy-governing board, FWL/EBCE included a provision that "where their recommendations are not adopted and acted upon, management will provide documented justification."[49] Also, Board members could protest any decision or action by resigning and filing a protest with OPS or NIE.

It was also felt that an effective governance structure required: (1) creating a formal mechanism for student and parental input to policy-making, and (2) broadening Board membership to include representatives of major financial organizations, institutions of higher education, and other segments of the employer community in which there is high student interest and a large future demand.

The steps taken to achieve the "genuine policy-governing board" were enumerated in the FY 74 Operating Plan:

1. Preparing a formal charter which spells out the purpose, functions, responsibilities and authority of the Policy Advisory Board.

2. Organize the Board and elect officers no later than the September Board meeting. Standing committees should also be found at that time to give concentrated and continuing attention to such issues as educational purposes and goals, relationships with the public schools, employer roles and incentives, target student populations, student certification, and future plans (including funding) for the local program.

---

49. Ibid., p. 31.

3. Form a group of students and parents to consider policy issues and make recommendations.[50]

The membership of the Policy Advisory Board was also expanded to include financial institutions, local colleges and a local hospital. An option was developed whereby other members could be added by Board decision during the year. The total membership was expected to be fifteen.

In March 1974, FWL reported to NIE that significant progress had been made in strengthening the Policy Advisory Board. Some specific accomplishments cited as evidence for this assessment were:

1. The PAB formed a new standing committee on school operations to provide advice to the staff of FWS.

2. FWS parents have organized and named a representative to PAB who will serve on the committee on school operations.

3. FWS students held an election to name a student (and an alternate) to serve on the PAB and who will serve on the Committee on School Operations.

4. Four additional seats on the PAB were established and will be filled by March 20. The additional members were selected to strengthen women, minority groups and labor representation, and because of their ability to make effective input to FWS operations.

5. A PAB Executive Committee has been formed to handle on-going Board business resulting in more expeditious handling of the full-Board agenda, and more time for the standing committees to meet on their specialized agendas.[51]

By June 1974, FWL adjudged that the improved organization and functioning of the Policy Advisory Board were stable, and that the problems in this area had been resolved. From their perspective, "the problems encountered during the time taken to make this progress may be the source of valuable insights into the dynamics of

---

50. Ibid., p. 31.

51. FWL, "Second Quarterly Report FY 1974," March 15, 1974, p. 20.

advisory bodies. We believe that a potential adopter of EBCE should use a strategy of deferring decisions on the composition of the advisory body to avoid becoming 'locked in' to a governance strategy until the unique characteristics of the adopting committee can be understood."[52] A FWL staff member remarked: "We were never really sure that NIE changed its stance. FWL has been accused of not taking governance seriously by NIE. An advisory board can, if it wants to, be very powerful." One special operating condition of the 1974 FWL/EBCE program contract did refer to the organization of the governing body, and the feasibility and desirability of including parents and students as members. FWL satisfied NIE on September 30, 1973 that the considerations had been met.

FWL/EBCE's concern for the emphasis on the composition of the Policy Advisory Board are notable. For example, the PAB developed and is using a "Matrix for Planning the Composition of the EBCE PAB." which will become part of the documentation on Policy Advisory Requirements. The present version provides "cells" by sex, ethnic identity, and age-range for the following categories: Private Employers, Public Agencies (except schools), Organized Labor, School Districts, Business and Professional Associations, Individual Professionals and Entrepreneurs, EBCE Students, and EBCE Parents. Again, the reason for such weight being given to this aspect is that boards playing an active role in the activities of organizations serve more to link the organization to the community and the elements it possesses, than to link the organization to other educational agencies.

---

52. FWL, "Third Quarterly Report FY 1974," June 20, 1974, p. 8.

CHAPTER 5

AEL/EBCE: THE SCHOOL SYSTEM-PROOF MODEL

In 1972, Appalachia Educational Laboratory outlined a four-year plan for developing a model of Employer-Based Career Education for grades 8-12. As noted in Chapter 1, the present EBCE programs recruit only high school students (sophomores may or may not be included). Therefore, marked changes in AEL's strategy for evolving a career education model have necessarily occurred. Given the structure of the program, interorganizational relationships--particularly those between the EBCE program and employers, the school system, and the Advisory Council--have always had a pivotal importance. The striking shift that took place in the strategy for developing the AEL/EBCE model suggests that analyzing these three sets of interorganizational relations, both as they currently exist and in the extent and ways they have changed over time, may highlight dimensions and processes that were not manifest at other sites.

The School System-Proof Model

During the 1960's, the Physical Science Study Committee (PSSC) was one of the most successful curriculum improvement projects funded by NSF. That is, the Committee devised the teaching materials required for a high school course in modern physical science and demonstrated that what it created was scientifically, educationally, and commercially feasible. PSSC's approach was that "materials were more malleable than people: they could be changed and changed and changed again at small loss; once perfected, they could be reproduced and distributed anywhere and anytime in whatever quantities were needed."[1] Further, since the materials were the products of technology, they would keep the integrity involved in their design in any school in the nation. The focus of "the scientists' concern was not what teachers might do with these materials, but what the use of such materials might do to students studying modern

---

1. Paul E. March, "Wellsprings of Strategy: Considerations Affecting Innovations by the PSSC," in Matthew B. Miles (ed.), Innovations in Education (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964), pp. 251-252.

physical science."[2] In effect, this represented what became known as the "teacher-proof" approach. Given the problems and issues involved in changing teachers' attitudes and behaviors, PSSC emphasized the development of new materials that would be designed and constructed so as to inform and instruct the student directly.

By analogy, the AEL/EBCE program implicity employs a "school system-proof" strategy. The instructional delivery system that has been developed by AEL is so comprehensive and interrelated in content, structure, and related support systems that it is almost complete in itself. The AEL/EBCE program and materials would instruct teachers and students in a direct manner, and the unique characteristics of an adopting school system would have minimal effect in their utilization. That is, the basic manuals, documents, and resources required to operate the AEL/EBCE program are organized in such a way that the influence of external and internal system and school variables on its implementation is probably less than that of other regional laboratory programs. While the school system-proof approach seems to characterize the overall program, it is also the case that specific components of the program can be adopted, consistent with NIE replication policy.

EBCE - Employers Relationships

In describing the history and background of the program, AEL noted that it "began its design and development activities under a mandate described as 'directed development'; i.e., a set of program characteristics which it was required to meet. These included the basic student population (e.g., high school age, cross-section of abilities, race, sex, achievement), program characteristics (e.g., employer-site locus of instruction, blending of career and academic activities and learning outcomes, individualization of instruction, student participation in decisions, involvement of employers and community in policy and decision-making, documentation for program replicability), and general outcomes (e.g., provision for ultimate governance by institutions other than the laboratories, documentation for replicability, increasing cost-effectiveness to a level commensurate with alternatives and benefits)."[3] By definition, the employer-site location of instructional activities and the integration

---

2. Ibid., p. 252.

3. AEL, "FY 73 Final Report," October 15, 1973, p. 2.

of career development and academic learning activities imply interrelationships between the EBCE project and employers. In fact, EBCE's need for an exchange relationships with employers is crucial to maintaining the program. From the reverse perspective, employers do not require a relationships with EBCE for their organization's continued functioning. Despite this, their motivation to participate is high. AEL has identified several factors which are apparently responsible for successful employer cooperation and participation:

> First, public goodwill has been achieved by the rather extensive publicity EBCE has been able to provide. Conversely, employers themselves have also provided public relations materials regarding their participation in the EBCE program in order to enhance their community image. There also appears to be genuine employer belief in and commitment to a career education program of the EBCE type. Employers have continually made remarks to the effect that a practical career experience program has long been needed as part of the secondary educational system. Also, and to a more limited extent, some employers have regarded EBCE students as a potential labor recruitment market. This has been evidenced not only by employer comments to this effect, but also by the fact that several students have in fact received job offers from EBCE employers.[4]

While differences in organizational needs must be taken into account in analyzing the exchange of elements among organizations, the experiences of the EBCE program suggest that, in some contexts, its theoretical or practical value may not be as great as has been assumed.

As noted in Chapter 3, the processes involved in achieving domain consensus comprise much of the interaction between organizations. "Moreover, to the extent that these processes involve proferring information about the availability of elements as well as about rights and obligations regarding the elements, they constitute a form of interorganizational exchange."[5] Even prior to

---

4. AEL, "Operational Plan, FY 1974," July 1973, p. D-3.

5. Sol Levine and Paul E. White, "Exchange as a Conceptual Framework for the Study of Interorganizational Relationships," Administrative Science Quarterly, V (1961), p. 599.

the official assignment of EBCE staff to this critical aspect of program functioning, exchange relationships between them and employers existed. The official records of the project state that in 1972:

> Prior to [awarding of the contract on May 11], the staff charged with employer development responsibilities could only proceed on a tentative basis in their contact work. Specific questions (i.e., nature and extent of student involvement at employer sites) raised by employers could not be adequately answered because the program activities that could provide these answers had not, at that time, reached a sufficient level of productivity.[6]

The educational function of this set of interorganization relationships has resulted in continuing readjustment and compromise, i.e., in a negotiation or bargaining process characterizing the achievement of domain consensus. There is a discernable trend in the official records toward stating in detail the rights and responsibilities of employers, so that orientation would be sufficient to attain consensus. Simultaneously, the dominant motif of the relationship of AEL/EBCE with employers has been progressive standardization of the agreement underlying the exchange. For example, both EBCE and employer representatives could be actively involved in arriving at the terms of the agreement or the terms could be explicitly defined by EBCE (or an employer) for all who might wish to conform to them. In the latter instance, a Letter of Agreement or similar arrangement would probably be utilized. There is no mention in AEL's records of such formal agreements existing between the program and individual employers. Rather, the emphasis is on "standardizing" the exchange relationship by making use of information from each site, collected and printed in a uniform format, which outlines the nature of the organizational elements, and rights and obligations regarding them. If the prior agreement on which the exchange relationship is based is implicit and informal, the description of the employer organization and the elaboration of the type and level of activities offered function to make the relationship explicit, at least from the student's perspective.

AEL reports mention that during the period from April 1, 1972 to June 30, 1972, time limitations were pressing, so the EBCE staff centered their efforts on a

---

6. AEL, "Quarterly Report," August 1, 1972, p. 8.

restricted number of employer sites that offered the broadest range of career and academic opportunities. Materials were generated that matched employer sites against career clusters, USOE Job Codes, and academic subjects. In this way, a list of 12 employers that would receive priority attention was identified. Plans were developed for securing commitments from these key sites as well as others that might become available immediately. The schedule of EBCE activities called for conducting in-depth, on-site analyses and arranging initial student exploration activities in August 1972.[7]

By December 1972, a major obstacle to the ongoing instructional system design strategy was the incompleteness of the employer site analysis. "Ideally, selected employer sites should have been analyzed indepth prior to full scale instructional planning. In actuality, the time and staff pressures only allowed opportunity for site analysis to the somewhat limited degree required for student orientation and career exploration; indepth analysis is now being performed and is being inserted into the instructional system prior to the point where students are ready for indepth experiences."[8] At the same time, program management viewed clarifying and elaborating relationships with employers as having high priority. Attention was to be turned to:

> Intensive analysis and development of employer/ community sites to the degree which will be required to: (a) allow students to have planned and intensive exposure to career requirements and opportunities; (b) enhance the degree of integration between academic studies and on-site activities; and (c) allow for the shift of the focus of learning away from the learning center and into community sites.[9]

The resolution of operational and logistical problems critical to maintaining the EBCE program as a going concern permitted effort to be applied to implementing other aspects of the program, such as employer site analysis, which were among its distinguishing characteristics.

---

7. Idem.

8. AEL, "Quarterly Report," December 1, 1972, p. 5.

9. Ibid., p. 32.

During April 1973, the "somewhat primitive approach" still utilized in finding and using employer sites lead to an expression of concern about this area of instructional system development:

> Categorization and description of the specific utility of individual employer sites (although it has improved steadily) is still too limited. This causes some difficulties in coordination of student activities and in the gathering and distribution of sufficiently detailed feedback information from specific employers (particularly in the quality of student performance while on-site).[10]

The basic problem was "represented by the need to settle on a reasonably systematic means of finding employers, recruiting them, resolving the logistics of using the sites, and communications within the staff about site needs, possibilities, and activities."[11] AEL perceived that most of these questions at issue had been solved by devising and implementing forms, installing procedures, using "communications systems", and the like. For example, the formal analysis of individual employer sites, originally scheduled for completion early in the program year, was replaced by a procedure which gathered data through student experiences with sites. In effect, the sharing of problems (and hence of domains or work) with limited agreement as a counterpart to authority had not been sufficiently elucidated so that the employers could function effectively. The interorganizational invention needed revision and improvement. AEL's conclusive assessment was that "the structure had stabilized sufficiently so that the system worked, although not with peak efficiency."[12]

Discussions of achieving domain consensus have focused on the characteristics of the process as it occurs between two organizations. AEL records shed light on the point of view of its own staff in relation to present and probable future experiences with the process:

> In light of the experiences with 44 students and some 350 site placements during this year, the staff has approached the employer-site

---

10. AEL "Quarterly Report," April 13, 1973, p. 27.

11. Ibid., p. 28.

12. Idem.

> analysis task this summer with much greater confidence and considerably more detailed and "tighter" conceptualizations. Also, by implementing it during the summer, the operating staff people can participate, which can have important side-effects on morale, coordination, common understandings, etc., during the stabilization year.[13]

It appears that the organizational roles of the participants in the process may have unintended consequences for the implementation of the exchange relationship.

The basic goal of stabilizing the EBCE educational delivery system by the end of FY 74 in order to have a well-documented model for field-testing included as an intermediate objective "the completion of employer-site analysis, with a variety of employer-site activities keyed to individual student needs and interests."[14] The purpose of conducting detailed Employer Site Analyses was to produce Learning Guides which would list the specific learning opportunities available at each employer site. Because of its obvious importance to successfully achieving the goals of the EBCE program, the site analysis process was initiated with an in-service training program for six site developers. (These individuals had been Learning Managers in AEL/EBCE during FY 1972.) After being trained in the purposes, procedures, and skills necessary for site analysis, conducting a "dry run-through inhouse" using EBCE staff members, and participating in a workshop on activity writing, the three teams, each comprised of two members, engaged in an actual site examination. They were also provided with a detailed checklist to insure the collection of the information necessary for the Learning Guide. By October 1973, approximately half of the cooperating employer sites had been analyzed, with appropriate activities developed. All sites were to have been analyzed by January 1974. Because of time restrictions and developmental exigencies, the work was completed by subcontracting the site analyses to a faculty member at a local college. Utilizing the procedures that had been evolved, the analyses were completed both expeditiously and economically.

Having systematized some significant aspects of achieving domain consensus by developing the procedures for Learning Guides, orientation succeeded negotiation as

---

13. AEL, "Operational Plan, FY 1974," July 1973, p. H-7.

14. AEL, "FY 73 Final Report," October 15, 1973, p. 19.

the dominant mode in the process. That is, in January 1975, "an orientation pamphlet for the Resource Person which explains her/his role is personally delivered on the first day of a student's placement."[15]

In December 1974, AEL/EBCE noted that "with an increased number of students, there have been problems in coordinating student assignments to experience sites of their choice."[16] The type of management system required to insure minimal conflict and delay in securing site placements had to be ascertained. It appeared that a data display system indicating the relationship between (1) each kind of career experience available at sites, (2) resource person availability, and (3) availability dates might be the answer. AEL/EBCE placed high priority on solving this issue: "The resolution of the coordinating requirements of experience site placements appears to be a key element to replication of the EBCE program."[17] In a program where sustained relationships between EBCE and employers are still an open issue, it is interesting that a coordinating problem encountered by the program staff has assumed such significance. Indeed, it raises the question: under what conditions do inter- as opposed to intra-organizational relationships and problems have more direct consequences for program effectiveness?

At AEL, the effort to systematize, as much as possible, the relations between EBCE and employers was reflected in staffing assignments and requests. In July 1973, a new staff position, employer liaison coordinator, was to supplement that of employer liaison and recruitment person. The employer liaison coordinator had major responsibility for "initiating and coordinating more effective systems for employer/community input into decision-making and prototype revision, and acting as prime coordinator of interaction among the EBCE staff, employers, and the school systems."[18] The function of the employer liaision and recruitment person (employer relations specialist in FY 1973) was to recruit and negotiate with employers for instructional purposes.[19]

---

15. AEL, "Quarterly Report," January 1, 1975, p. 4.

16. AEL, "Quarterly Progress Report, December 1, 1973-February 28, 1974," p. 27.

17. Idem.

18. AEL, "Operational Plan, FY 1974," July 1973, p. H-10.

19. Idem.

Although the evolution of the position is not mentioned in earlier reports, an employer-site analyst was also included in the Design/Development Unit at that time. She had the responsibility "for continuing site analysis, receiving feedback from operations through the stabilizing unit and the employer-site analysis coordination, preparing and updating the compendium of employer site activities, and providing a continuous update/additions listing to the learning coordinators during the stabilizing phase."[20]

In FY 1975, the reorganized AEL/EBCE program included the newly created role of the Employer Relations and Placement Person. Within the new structure, it was hoped that this position would expand the communications between all experience site people and EBCE.

The changes in the organization of the program, the staff reductions because of fiscal restrictions, and the different phases in the evolution of the project, including variable numbers of students, make even speculation about the connection between staffing and the EBCE-employer set of interorganizational relationships of little use, even though it is a critical issue for the program.

EBCE - School System Relations

While the other sets of organizational interrelations which we examine are basically voluntary, the relationship between EBCE and the school system is, to a large extent, required by law or results from the traditional division of labor among organizations whose clients are minors. State laws governing the mode and length of school attendance as well as permissible types of schooling result in different social and legal responsibilities for such organizations. AEL/EBCE recognize that "the nature and extent of required LEA/SEA cooperation was primarily dictated by the following characteristics of [the program]: (1) that mechanisms be established to award high school diplomas to the participants; and (2) that provisions assuring re-entry into the public school system be available to students who might withdraw from the EBCE program."[21] A prior program need for student clients constitutes a dominant reason for cooperation with the school system that AEL

---

20. Idem.

21. AEL, "Quarterly Report," August 1, 1972, p. 4.

appears to have assumed as a given. In fact, AEL/EBCE possesses a high degree of dependency on the Kanawha County School System for access to students, which are prerequisite to the existence and functioning of the program.

To secure initial approval from KCSS to establish the EBCE program, AEL presented a description of the program at a meeting of 11 high school principals. Seven principals indicated their interest and willingness to participate. At a subsequent Board of Education meeting, AEL received permission to continue the development of procedures for identifying possible students. However, AEL was enjoined not to contact students, pending answers being furnished to certain questions raised by the Board. The issues viewed as critical to the decision about cooperation with AEL were: "satisfying state requirements (in obtaining waivers for students in the program), more precise information concerning AEL/school system reporting mechanisms, and college perception and response to the EBCE concept."[22] In May 1972, the School Board voted to allow AEL to proceed with the student identification procedure and to contact students at the high schools.

Following the Board decision, AEL staff members instituted working relationships "with a variety of school system personnel, including principals, English teachers, high school guidance counselors, and the County Director of Guidance and Counseling."[23] The context of these interactions with members of the school system, which is very important, is not described in the records.

While the EBCE program is highly dependent on the school system for recruiting clients, AEL also had to rely on KCSS to make certain program policy decisions that would or could influence significantly the evolution of the program.

> A major decision--crucial to the EBCE concept--was that AEL's EBCE program could structure student learning activities, in an interdisciplinary manner, and then translate those activities into units suitable for graduate credit. This decision--made by the school personnel--allowed the program extreme flexibility in linking on-site and

---

22. Idem.

23. Idem.

> academic activities, yet protected the students through assuring their graduate credits. Another key decision was that made by the school system that the EBCE program, as an experimental operation, was to be allowed to design and implement its curricula in whatever ways it chose, without any pressure to make such curricula conform to traditional school subjects and divisions.[24]

In effect, these decisions placed no restrictions on the design of the instructional delivery system. It is evident once more that establishing domain consensus and the conditions of exchange with the school system is necessary before relationships with employers can be instituted fully.

In July 1973, AEL adjudged that "to date the relationships between the EBCE program and the public schools have adequately supported the needs of the developing program."[25] At that time, negotiations were in process with the school board to extend the authorization for the EBCE program for another year. AEL did not anticipate that any current relationships would be altered markedly in purpose and focus during FY 74. The need to formalize, adjust, and build upon the existing relationships was given more emphasis than resolving unspecified problems that had been encountered. Specifically, AEL felt that "the current status of institutional relations must be adjusted in two major ways: increased formality and systemization of relations (to enhance the durability and replicability of the program) and review and possible revision of current relations to reflect the changes in the instructional system which will and are taking place (e.g., solidified goal structure, more date on employer site activities, new staffing and procedure models)."[26] These proposed changes reflect a concern for adjusting appropriately the negotiation process that achieves and maintains domain consensus with the school system by proferring updated information about elements and promoting formality to enhance objectivity.

The nature of the looser accountability and supervision characteristic of interorganizational relations, which was probably specified in the authorization for the program, is not described in the official reports. To

---

24. AEL, "Operational Plan, FY 1974," July 1973, p. B-4.

25. Ibid., p. C-6.

26. Idem.

insure that students in the experimental program did receive a quality education, "the school system required frequent reports and liaison."[27] While the schools also expressed a strong desire for increased involvement in the review and assessment of the program, this was ascribed to their interest in adopting EBCE as a public school program after it had stabilized and proven its value.

The codification of AEL's experiences with the school system into a set of procedures, policies, and documents for possible replication was to include such aspects as the postures and expectations of the school system, the information required by them in order to reach a decision, the procedures used to obtain legal local and state waivers, and the like.[28] It was noted that "the practices are working well in the greater Charleston area; the need is to document them so that they will be of value when other communities implement EBCE programs."[29]

The relationships with the Kanawha County School System in 1973-74 were to be "extensive", so as to facilitate possible field testing of the EBCE program by KCSS in 1974-75. Implicitly, AEL assumed that a closer relationship in the future would require an early increase in the frequency of communication and interaction in order to facilitate cooperation and minimize conflict. This idea about the nature of interorganizational relationships may or may not be valid.

In February 1974, an official report indicates the nature of the expanded relation with the schools:

> EBCE and the school system's central office have continued to exchange full information concerning events and concerns about the EBCE Program. These exchanges include a monthly report to KCSS, memoranda, submission of newly-developed program materials to KCSS for review, frequent phone calls, and several meetings. Ongoing program relations remain highly cooperative.[30]

---

27. Ibid., p. B-4.

28. Ibid., p. F-8.

29. Ibid., p. F-9.

30. AEL,"Quarterly Report, December 1, 1973-February 28, 1974," p. 6.

While it has been found that frequency of interaction seems to lead to both better coordination and more conflict, it apparently has resulted in the former, not the latter condition at AEL. It is also noted in the same report that EBCE has maintained frequent grass roots contact with personnel at cooperating high schools. In large part this contact involved administrative communications.

In responding to a question on changes in the type of issues discussed with the school system, an AEL staff member remarked:

> At the very beginning, when the program got started, the issue was will you let us carpetbaggers come in and develop an alternative school. That had to be done each year. Shortly after that, the right to recruit students for the program. In the back of your mind, you wonder how good is it, what you've done; gradually, you establish credibility. Then it becomes a matter of when can the program be installed, when can we have it.

These modifications are also mirrored in the official records: there is decreased emphasis on "identifying, attaining, and maintaining appropriate relationships with the public schools" from 1972 to 1974 and more concern for and analysis of problems associated with the field test to be conducted by the school system. In fact, "a real problem" relative to the trial of the prototype occurred because NIE was viewed as being reluctant to conduct a field test even though it had been included in the Operating Plan. A report dated February 1974 elaborates the issue:

> AEL's Operational Plan was built on the assumption that the Kanawha County School System would assume responsibility for operating AEL/EBCE's prototype during FY 75. This assumption in turn rested on the belief . . . that by August 1974, AEL's prototype would be sufficiently stabilized to turn it over to the school system with certain controls in order to address the question, "what will happen to EBCE when it is operated by a school system?"[31]

---

31. Ibid., p. 8.

The major areas of concern in implementing transfer of the program to the school system were funding, evaluation, controls on program alterations, relationships between AEL and the Kanawha County School System and the community's role. These issues were in the process of being resolved in early 1974 when NIE proposed a "steady-state incubator program" to be operated by the four regional laboratories in FY 75. The major objective of this phase was to permit "comprehensive and controlled evaluation of the EBCE prototypes in order to generate reliable and valid information concerning the quality and nature of each."[32] Since the incubator test had not been included in the FY 74 Operational Plan, considerable uncertainty about AEL's existing commitments and relationships with KCSS resulted.

The dilemma was that NIE, the funding source, and KCSS, the cooperating school system, were anticipating different operational arrangements during FY 75. The situation was exacerbated because:

> AEL's staff felt committed to both parties because of the cooperative and mutually rewarding relationships established during the past two years and because the arguments for each type of field test appeared strong and important. Moreover, AEL felt that letting down either party might be disastrous to the future of an emerging, exciting and workable EBCE prototype. Alienation of either NIE or KCSS could cripple AEL's ability to continue operations.[33]

To resolve the contradictory expectations, AEL/EBCE proposed a dual field test. They suggested that the EBCE prototype would operate in several locations in Kanawha County during FY 75. One site, the current Learning Center, would be maintained and staffed by AEL and would be the target for the intensive external summative evaluation proposed by NIE. The other sites or satellites would be operated by the Kanawha County School System and would conform to the scheme laid out in the FY 74 Operational Plan. " . . . This strategy would demonstrate how EBCE operates in a rigorously controlled incubator setting and also how it operates in the real world setting of a school system. Further, this approach would allow for comparisons of the two settings."[34]

---

32. Ibid., p. 9.

33. Idem.

34. Idem.

NIE and AEL identified in concert the potential issues created by such a strategy. Some major concerns were: "[The] number of students who could be recruited, numbers of experience sites required (and how to use them in the context of two programs), evaluation difficulties, funding, and time available for planning."[35] The EBCE staff worked on possible solutions to these problems which would be acceptable to both parties. These discussions culminated in a decision by the NIE/CEP staff that AEL was to be allowed to plan for a dual test with certain restrictions. AEL's reaction was that "the restrictions imposed by NIE can be met and that AEL and KCSS can devise a field test configuration for FY 75 which will satisfy all parties."[36]

The responsibilities and commitments of each of the three parties (NIE, AEL, and KCSS) to the resulting subcontract for Phase I of the dual test in Kanawha County were detailed in the FY 75 Prospectus.

> [The project director] for the KCSS/EBCE program will be working out of the KCSS Superintendent's office so as to provide the highest level of leadership to the KCSS/EBCE FY 75 Field Test. . . . KCSS/EBCE staff will be recruited from existing faculty members at Charleston High School. KCSS personnel are planning to use the EBCE Community Advisory Council plus receiving inputs from an existing KCSS Work Experience Advisory Council.[37]

In addition, a KCSS Task Force was established by AEL/EBCE primarily to facilitate the establishment and operational efficiency of the KCSS program.

This circumstance has led to the existence of a complex relationship between AEL/EBCE and the school system. Because of its participation in the field test, where its relationships are basically voluntary, facilitative or cooperative patterns would be expected. However, much interaction is also dictated or required by law, which leads to a differing type of responsibility to be carried out simultaneously. To some extent, EBCE's

---

35. Idem.

36. Ibid., p. 11.

37. AEL, "Operation of EBCE Program by AEL and KCSS, Prospectus FY 75," p. 9.

high level of dependency on the school system for certain elements, most notably students, has been counterbalanced by KCSS's increased dependency on AEL for resources and technical assistance. The analysis of the outcomes of this arrangement should contribute to our understanding how interorganizational relationships impact upon themselves.

EBCE-Community Advisory Council Relations

Consonant with the requirements of the mandate of directed development in the area of governance, an Advisory Council concerned with policy determination was established at AEL in April 1972. Control of the EBCE program by a legal consortium as originally conceptualized by NIE has not occurred, but a new strategy based on the experience of the first year of the program's functioning has evolved.

When the contract for the EBCE program was awarded, AEL perceived two alternatives relative to the development of a consortium: (1) immediate creation, or (2) delayed creation accompanied by intervening developmental activities.[38] The Advisory Council, which was composed of 15 representatives from business, labor, education, and other interested community agencies and individuals, approved the initiation of program development activities. AEL's response was that "considering the time frame involved it seemed both unreasonable and unfair to expect a group composed largely of non-educators to assume immediate, legal responsibility to have a program ready for field test by September 1972. It seemed more efficient for AEL to assume immediate responsibility for developmental efforts."[39] The revised strategy specified that a legal consortium was to be created by June 1, 1973 and to assume responsibility for the program in the summer of 1973. The advantages of this policy were: (1) most potential consortium members would have direct insights into and experience with the program from their participation in the first year's field test, so that their decision to join the consortium would be more realistic and enduring; and (2) the Advisory Council would comprise the nucleus for the legal consortium and their experience in working with each other and familiarity with the program would improve their decision-making about its timing and organizational structure.[40]

---

38. AEL, "Quarterly Report," August 1, 1972, p. 3.

39. Idem.

40. Ibid., pp. 3-4.

The plans projected for the Advisory Council in July and August 1972 were "to increase their activity through the development of a more formal council structure and specific input mechanisms." The outcome of these plans is not mentioned in the records.

Because of exigencies faced by the operational program, the Advisory Council did not have any significant role in policy determination between September and December of 1972. This circumstance resulted from severe time pressures encountered by the EBCE staff in trying to create, implement, and revise the ongoing program during its initial period. A report in July 1973 describes the situation in more detail:

> The staff simply did not have time to fully brief the Advisory Council as to the complex and sophisticated instructional delivery system being developed, since their full-time efforts were being devoted to creating and revising that system. Without such insights, the Advisory Council could not make policy decisions.[41]

In late December and early January 1973, the creation of a consortium by April 1973 was given high priority. At a meeting of the Advisory Council held during this period, the Director and two staff members of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory related their experiences with consortium formation and operation. As a result, most Council members were willing to move toward consortium formation without postponement. Two weeks later, a committee was established to plan the next step for formalizing consortium organization. They were advised "of the anticipated arrival of Guidelines from NIE and the hope of clearer directions to serve as decision points for continued efforts to form the Consortium."[42] Lawyers for EBCE had also reviewed the organizational mechanics.

During this same period, the Charleston "Committee of 100" indicated that they might want to be involved informing the consortium. After attending a few meetings in which reports from both organizations were discussed and information was exchanged, "the Executive Council [of the Committee of 100] said they liked the things they

---

41. AEL, "Operational Plan, FY 1974," July 1973, p. B-2.

42. AEL, "Quarterly Report," April 13, 1973, p. 37.

understood about the program but could not make a total commitment to formal involvement as an official function ...." The EBCE staff also met with the Chamber of Commerce about the feasibility of transferring control of the program to a legal Charleston consortium. This organization reacted with strong interest, too, but felt that legal control constituted an inappropriate type of involvement for them. "[Both organizations] felt that such control would have to be preceded by a great deal of long-range thought and planning, and that at present the program was inadequately stabilized and validated to justify such efforts."[43] Apart from the stage of development of the program, it can be predicted that a basic issue in this matter related to achieving domain consensus. It will be recalled that "the domain of an organization consists of the specific goals it wishes to pursue and the functions it undertakes in order to implement its goals."[44] Because of the scarcity of elements, organizations must select, on the basis of expediency or efficiency, particular functions that permit them to achieve their ends as fully as possible.[45] The extent to which assuming legal responsiblity for EBCE would constitute a function that would facilitate achieving organizational goals would be a major question for the Committee of 100 or the Chamber of Commerce. In fact, the issue appears to have had such serious implications that considerable attention to it would be required.

In April 1973, it was decided that determining whether a consortium would be created was to be postponed for a year. At the same time, "the Advisory Council's mandate was changed to exploration of such a creation on a long-range basis. At present, the Council is working with the EBCE staff to plan for creation of a single, systematic structure for providing community participation and leadership in the EBCE program."[46]

Between September 1972 and June 1973, the role of the Advisory Council had changed in several ways and "several other groups were used to obtain community input into program policy-making."[47] The rationale for seeking

---

43. Idem.

44. Levine and White, op. cit., p. 597.

45. Ibid., p. 586.

46. AEL, "Operational Plan, FY 1974," July 1973, p. B-2.

47. Idem.

broader input and for revising the concept of the Advisory Council is not presented in any report. The other groups consulted included parents and business organizations. The contacts with business organizations have already been described. Parents were to be represented by means of a Council, and to serve with employers, the school system, and students as staff-external participants in evaluating the program. A Parents' Advisory Council was established in September 1973. Their primary area of concern was to be student activities such as "student and employer site recruitment, identifying resource materials, and identifying resource persons in the community to complement the activities of the Learning Coordinators."[48] This group would also act as a publicity and public relations agent for the Program. It would not determine EBCE policy.

As AEL/EBCE changed its strategy towards governance of the program from establishing a legal employers consortium to the possible adoption and operation by the local school system, the role of the Advisory Council shifted simultaneously. Rather than attempting to create a formal consortium immediately, the Council worked with the EBCE staff on developing a single, systematic structure for providing community participation in the program. In December 1974, the reorganized Community Advisory Council had found that its new materials and processes were being well-received. The stages through which the Council has passed emphasizes the fact that if boards play an active role in the activities of educational programs, they serve more to link the organization to the community and the elements it possesses than to link the organization either to other educational or employer organizations.[49]

---

48. AEL, "Quarterly Progress Report, September 1, 1973-November 30, 1973," pp. 25-26.

49. Levine and White, op. cit., p. 595.

CHAPTER 6

RBS/EBCE:
THE SCHOOL SYSTEM INCORPORATION MODEL

Research for Better Schools, Inc., is counted among the regional laboratories involved early in developing the employer based career education concept. It conducted a feasibility study for NIE from June to December 1971. Of the four EBCE programs, RBS has instituted the most marked modifications of its model during its evolution.

During the first year, the project operated a comprehensive educational program and was comprised of a staff working in cooperation with the Board of Directors of the Academy for Career Education (ACE--the private school licensed by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania), the Greater Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, and participating employers, agencies, and community volunteers. The 106 students were all eleventh graders. In 1973-74, the project was revised. A "core" educational program was developed and implemented in the Academy for students who received a supplementary educational program at their home school. Approximately 75 tenth and eleventh grade students were enrolled and participated in the core program for two or three days a week. The public schools, not the Academy, would award the diploma to these students. During this year, the Academy students entering the twelfth grade also took part in the core program. A supplementary program was provided for them by the Academy so that they could graduate from the private school. During 1974-75, the Academy for Career Education became an educational program offered by the Philadelphia School District and located in Olney High School. It was no longer a private institution. The 256 students enrolled in RBS/EBCE were in grades 9-12.

One unchanging characteristic of the program has been the existence of interorganizational relations which are critical for the organizations involved, the community of which they are a part, and the clients served by such relationships. The frequent revisions in the project's strategy suggest that the relations between the EBCE program and employers, the school district, and the advisory board should be examined to determine the alterations and continuities in them. Specifically, in what ways and to what extent have the various sets of interorganizational relations been modified during the program's existence?

The School System Incorporation Model

NIE's original conceptualization of the EBCE program had specified that a consortium, primarily composed of employers, was to assume responsibility for each project as soon as feasible. While RBS complied with the mandate of directed development in the area of governance by establishing the Academy for Career Education as a legal entity to assume eventual control, it recognized that "the long-term success of the model rests upon its impact on the public school system." By May 1973, RBS was stating forcefully the importance of this orientation: "The existing prototype implies that the public schools possess no capability for the delivery of meaningful learning experiences and that a cooperative relationship with the public schools is a negative factor."[1] In developing its EBCE model, RBS sought and involved the school system in a closer official relationship than did any other EBCE project. In fact, in February 1974, RBS phrased the strategy for developing its prototype as: "The Philadelphia model is moving away from the operation of a private academy and toward the organization of an alternative program within the public school system capable of extension throughout the system and of providing the basis for a plan for comprehensive career education for the system."[2] In essence, RBS aimed to develop an EBCE program that would be incorporated into the local school system, rather than existing apart from it. This approach was in marked contrast to the initial conception of EBCE as "a complete, self-contained alternative to existing public secondary school. . . ."[3] While RBS's tactic was due in part to its assessment of the most efficacious way to integrate program approaches and to diffuse its model, RBS also appears to have become strongly committed, during the course of the project, to working within the school system, as opposed to influencing from outside.

---

1. RBS, "Revised Program Development Prospectus for EBCE Model, Executive Abstract," May 10, 1973, p. 20.

2. RBS, "Milestone 2: Preliminary Specifications on the Supplementary Program," February 15, 1974, p. 1.

3. Stalford, op. cit., p. I-19.

EBCE - Employer Relationships

In January 1972, RBS contacted employers about participating in the program as described in a conceptual model of the instructional systems that had been presented to the Advisory Board. Actually, the president of the Greater Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce initiated these contacts, which were followed up by the RBS staff. By the end of February, 15 employers had been reached and a group meeting of 30 additional employers was planned for early April.

As a consequence of its initial experiences, however, RBS felt that employers, taken together, were neither willing nor able to provide a total educational experience for students. Their participation and involvement would have to be gradually increased over a period of time. Further, "the task of gaining commitment from employers to be responsible for the meaningful education of students has been far more difficult than originally anticipated."[4] The reluctance of employers to become involved in this area was attributed to "the risk, available incentives, existing law, and established tradition and folklore."[5] RBS was convinced, however, that employers could be recruited in sufficient quantity and of sufficient quality so that a program could be developed.

The early involvement of the Chamber of Commerce, through its president, is noteworthy because it represented the utilization of a "directed intervention" strategy by RBS. The representative of an organization with legitimacy and credibility in the business community sought to encourage the cooperation and support of employers--recognized to be "the heart of the matter" for the EBCE program--by interceding in the program's behalf. While the Chamber of Commerce representative did not participate in the process of achieving domain consensus between the EBCE program and the employer, his introduction and orientation of the employer to the program may have increased the likelihood of its later occurrence. The context of the program, (i.e., a very large metropolitan area), and the need for an efficient tactic to secure employer cooperation may also be a factor in the approach used. While the rationale for this strategy cannot be determined definitively, the

---

4. RBS, "Quarterly Report," May 4, 1972, p. 7.

5. Idem.

Chamber of Commerce has been associated with the RBS/EBCE program continuously during the past three years, although the nature and extent of its involvement have varied.

During 1972-73, it functioned as a "front-runner" for RBS in its contact with employers, participated in the program as an employer, and offered the required World of Work Seminar, which provided an orientation to career exploration for all students. In 1973-74, RBS planned to make the revised private school/public school model more employer-based by allocating the responsibility for the Career Guidance Unit and the Career Development Unit to the Chamber. (The Career Skills Unit was to continue to be conducted at the Academy's central facility.) For this reason, RBS also intended to have the Greater Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce participate more fully in recommending and implementing Academy policies. In addition, by strengthening the Chamber's role as the major employer representative and by having more frequent and systematic interchange between the Chamber and individual participating employers, the increased policy involvement of employers would also be secured.

The Career Development Unit, which included the Career Exploration and Career Specialization Components, was staffed by eight employees of the Chamber, who were designated counselor-coordinators. RBS was responsible for their training and in-service assistance, and four RBS staff members assumed the primary responsibility for developing the Career Development Unit. The eight counselor-coordinators were also the staff for the Career Guidance Unit. RBS had the obligation to train them in the conceptualization, content, context, and process of this unit as well. The major responsibility for developing the Career Guidance Unit was assumed by three RBS members. With the assistance of RBS, the Chamber staff, in conjunction with participating employers, implemented a student orientation program for the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grade students.[6]

During 1974-75, the status of Academy for Career Education changed from that of a school to that of a program, operating as part of the Philadelphia School

---

6. RBS, "EBCE First Quarterly Report," April 15, 1973, p. 3.

District. The subcontract with the Chamber for operating the Career Development Unit and Career Guidance Unit was discontinued, and RBS took over the implementation of these units. The Chamber's role was now "recruiting employers for the Academy, insuring that input for revision/improvement is obtained and utilized, and serving in a consultative capacity to the Academy board."[7]

The role of the Chamber of Commerce in the operation of the RBS prototype is variously described as "organizational front-runner", the source of directed intervention, and major employer representative. The description of the relationship between the Chamber and RBS/EBCE is not sufficiently detailed in the records to permit an analysis; it is, however, an area that should be carefully examined in the future. It should be remarked that despite the extent to which interorganizational relations has become a favorite topic of sociologists, there are insufficient research findings to permit any sense of certainty about what interorganizational relationships are really like. However, we can point out, with certainty, issues (like the position of the Chamber vis-a-vis EBCE) that are potentially important practically and theoretically.

In April 1972, RBS conducted their major recruitment effort with employers by having a group meeting with 33 of them to explore their possible participation in ACE. To assist in attracting employers, RBS identified eight major clusters of occupations: communications, finance, government, health, manufacturing, research, utilities, and wholesale and retail sales. Initially, RBS planned to recruit three different employers in each of the clusters. The strategy was not successful. Commitment to participate in the program had been secured from 31 employers by the end of June, but there were more than three employers in some clusters, less than three in others, and some employers in areas outside the clusters. RBS commented that to obtain this level of employer commitment, more than 60 employers had had to be contacted, and that the process had been time-consuming.

In analyzing the 50 employer programs included in RBS/EBCE in July 1973, the staff identified as one strength "the trend toward interest, professional evaluation, and integration of programs at the cluster level."[8] The cluster approach to employer participation

---

7. RBS, "FY 75 EBCE Operating Plan," p. 31.

8. RBS, "Operating Plans for EBCE," July 20, 1973 p. 212.

has been an identifying characteristic of the RBS prototype throughout its development. The number and type of clusters, and the employers included in each, have changed periodically, but not the mode of organization. For example, in December 1973, 14 clusters were being offered to students with the participation of 42 employers; in June 1973, 36 employers were included in 14 clusters. During the first quarter of the 1974-75 school year, the Academy program provided 22 clusters comprising 70 employers. An inability to recruit continuously all the employers required by this scheme led to their realignment, so that there were 18 clusters in the second quarter.

One reason for the marked increase in the number of clusters over time was RBS's attempt to introduce more academic content into employer programs by adding clusters and related employers, for example, art and chemistry clusters. On the recommendation of employers, the clusters were also revised so that they had a clear career focus. During the second quarter of 1974, cluster meetings were "a significant operational activity." In March 1973, RBS states:

> Cluster meetings were held on a regularly scheduled basis. These meetings are ongoing and designed to assist employers in a specific cluster in reviewing programs and student objectives, attempting to solve problems that are common to the group, and receiving an update from the Counselor-Coordinator.[9]

Despite this communication mechanism, a luncheon meeting of all participating employers during the third quarter evidenced "the need to more effectively and efficiently orient employers."[10] Given the relatively large number of employers involved in the EBCE program in Philadelphia, cluster meetings may present an efficient method of intercommunication for RBS, but not for participating employers. The statement also suggests that the psychological gratifications of the exchange process between EBCE and employers cannot be neglected, and that strategies for increasing their sense of involvement have to be developed and maintained if motivation for prolonged participation is to be sustained. The existence of the

---

9. RBS, "EBCE Second Quarterly Report," March 1, 1974, p. 7.

10. RBS, "EBCE Third Quarterly Report," June 15, 1974, p. 8.

cluster scheme would appear to have been facilitated by the strategy developed by RBS and the Chamber for employer recruitment. The procedure was as follows: "(1) The Career Development Unit component informs the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce of the type of employer needed; (2) the Chamber of Commerce representatives contact the chief executive officer of a company or business and explain briefly the purposes of the program; (3) the Academic Field Coordinator is given the employer's name, person to contact, phone number, and address by the Chamber."[11] The fact that an organization with a high degree of legitimacy and widespread contacts in the business community sought out employer types that were in demand undoubtedly facilitated a more systematic approach to one program dimension than would have been possible if an individual staff member had carried out a similar effort.

In July 1973, RBS outlined its strategy for employer recruitment. By virtue of proferring information about the availability of organizational elements as well as about rights and obligations regarding them, it constituted a type of interorganization exchange. To some extent, the strategy also represented the solution to an issue that was to receive emphasis in the specifications for replication, specifically, it provided "procedures to facilitate mutual agreement for achieving goals and objectives among all parties involved."[12] The tactic, which had evolved out of several planning and development meetings with the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, included the following steps:

1. The Career Development Unit component informs the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce of the type of employer needed.

2. The Chamber of Commerce representative contacts the chief executive officer of a company or business and explains briefly the purposes of the program.

3. The Academic Field coordinator is given employer name, person to contact, phone number, and address by the Chamber.

---

11. RBS, "Operating Plan for EBCE," July 20, 1973, p. 133.

12. RBS, "Quarterly Report," January 3, 1973, p. 25.

4. The Academic Field coordinator follows up and arranges for a formal presentation.

5. A planning meeting is arranged with the employer which includes an introduction to the ACE and an explanation of the objectives for Career Exploration and/or Specialization.

6. Employers vary on the number of planning meetings needed. The objectives of the meetings include: (a) Explain the Career Education Program of RBS; (b) Describe the ACE; (c) Explain the objectives of Career Exploration and/or Specialization; (d) Get a commitment from the employer to become involved; (e) Design a program with the employer. Set up a schedule of dates of Exploration and/or Specialization.[13]

The interactions between the Chamber of Commerce and the employer were focused on orientation to the EBCE program. The communications between the Field Coordinator and the employer appear to be part of the negotiation process, necessarily involved in achieving domain consensus between the employer and EBCE. This strategy had to be supplemented at RBS, as at the other sites, by developing and systematizing the analysis of the employer site for instructional purposes. These two procedures, employer recruitment and employer site analysis, would provide the mechanisms for achieving domain consensus, the prerequisite to an ongoing exchange relationship between organizations.

In October 1973, a task report described the Employer Program Development Plan, designed to assist the Employer Coordinator designated by the employer and RBS Counselor-Coordinator in developing Career Exploration programs. The phase in which the Employer Coordinator develops a program in Career Exploration or Career Specialization included the following procedures:

1. The Counselor-coordinator arranges for a presentation with the Employer Coordinator. This presentation is in-depth and should consist of the following:

---

13. RBS, "Operating Plan for EBCE," July 20, 1973, p. 42.

a. How Career Exploration is operationalized.

b. A description of the function of the ACE, and the interrelationship of its component parts.

c. A description of the student population and the number enrolled.

d. The number of days desired for Career Exploration.

e. The goal of Career Education.

f. Specific program goals and how to operationalize these goals.

g. Explicate programs being offered by other or similar employers.

h. Give the rationale for the cluster system that is being used.

i. Answer questions or concerns that were raised by the Employer Coordinator.

j. Secure a commitment to begin a series of planning meetings with the Employer Coordinator to develop a program.[14]

In the next stage, the Exploration program is conducted jointly by the Employer Coordinator and the Counselor-coordinator, although primary responsibility rests with the latter. Ideally, the Employer Coordinator develops the instructional objectives, which are compared to and contrasted with the objectives of other employers participating in the cluster. Where no other programs have been developed in the cluster, they become the test set for the cluster. Then, it is determined how the situation can be structured to maximize the achievement of these instructional objectives by students. Based

---

14. RBS, "Task 10A1: Formulate Processes, Procedures, and Materials for Identification and Recruitment of Employer Participants, and for the Maintenance and Continuing Refinement of their Involvement," October 11, 1973, pp. 13-14.

upon their respective areas of expertise, the Employer Coordinator and the Counselor-coordinator "describe instructional activity plans for accomplishing each of the selected instructional objectives based upon data obtained in the site analysis."[15] Relative to the management system at each site, the Counselor-coordinator was to specify (1) the sequence of events; (2) the date, time, and location information; (3) the description of supervising responsibility; and (4) the credit allocations.[16] The Counselor-coordinator, in turn, relied on the Employer Coordinator to provide all information except for the amount of credit to be assigned to the instructional program.

In December 1973, RBS commented that these procedures had been instituted and were being revised on the basis of preliminary feedback from the field. An in-service training manual for employers was also developed and was being tested. A report in March 1974 stated: "Revised employer site analysis procedures were implemented and the feedback was positive."[17] Unfortunately, additional task reports on the revised procedures for utilizing employers were not available for analysis. However, a July 1974 report indicates the direction that modifications in this area are taking: "The revised site analysis will reflect more of a task analysis of specific occupations that individuals perform at employer sites."[18] Since the available Career Development Unit program materials included an Employer Site Analysis Package and the Employer Program Development Plans, significant progress was being made at the same time toward increased reliance on what would be classified as orientation rather than bargaining processes with employers. The codification of program procedures serves as an indicator of increasing standardization of them. Contract compliance regulations from NIE, mentioned by RBS in September 1974, required the documentation of its strategy with the Chamber of Commerce, the distribution of student time on employer sites, in the Learning Center, and in other community locations, and the strategy for maintaining employer involvement. They reflect NIE's concern for explicit information about issues involving employers, who comprise the nucleus of the program.

---

15. Ibid., p. 16.

16. Ibid., p. 7.

17. RBS, "EBCE Second Quarterly Report," March 1, 1974, p. 7.

18. RBS, "FY 75 EBCE Operating Plan," July 1974, p. 19.

The problems that have arisen relative to the Career Exploration and Career Specialization units serve to highlight some complex aspects of the relations between the EBCE program and employers. In January 1973, RBS noted that several difficulties had occurred and were being resolved in the Career Exploration programs, which were attended one day each week by all students. "The problems are mainly ones of student lateness, attendance, behavior and participation, and of the adjustments employers have had to make in dealing with students. ... The staff is working on these problems, is attempting to more closely supervise the programs, and is in the process of revising several programs."[19] At the same time, some employers revealed that they also had problems, but were commited to the EBCE concept and to improving their programs. During April 1973, students asked that the Career Exploration programs become more individualized and provide more "hands-on" experiences.[20] In July 1973, RBS perceived two strengths of the employer programs as "the trend toward more positive feedback from both employer and students," and "the trend toward higher levels of organization and predictability in the conduct of employer programs."[21] Although Career Specialization was part of the RBS/EBCE program after the second quarter of 1972-73, it was not until December 1973 that a report noted that seven students had enrolled in it during the first quarter of the 1973-74 year. Five employers provided these students an opportunity for an in-depth work related experience for one or two days a week. More significantly, RBS commented that "students have expressed some reluctance to specialize, and some Academic Board members and employers have questioned the value of the specializing experience. RBS believes in the value of specialization and attributes most of the lack of progress in this area to inadequate explanation and organization of specialization."[22] In the 1974-75 school year, the EBCE program planned that the career

---

19. RBS, "Quarterly Report," January 3, 1973, p. 7.

20. RBS, "Quarterly Report," April 16, 1973, p. 4.

21. RBS, "Operating Plan for EBCE," July 20, 1973, p. 212.

22. RBS, "EBCE First Quarterly Report," December 15, 1973, p. 6.

exploration clusters would emphasize more exposure and "hands-on" experience for specific occupational and career areas at employer sites.[23] And in December 1974, 12 students and eight employers had participated in the Career Specialization component during the first quarter.[24] Adjustments in the initial expectations of employers and students involved in an innovative program would not be considered unusual. It is important to note that the request for more individualized, "hands-on" experience and the reluctance to participate in specialization refer to deficiencies in the organization of learning experiences rather than to integral aspects of the relations between the employer and RBS/EBCE.

From the data available in the official records, it would be impossible to determine with any certainty the effect of size, i.e., number of students, on the development of the program. RBS has operated the largest EBCE project and for that reason may have encountered some unique problems. The number of employers required to maintian the program may be a case in point. In July 1972, a report remarks that "employer contacts and planning is an iterative and expanding process which must be continued throughout the life of the program if the program is to be truly effective."[25] This stance towards the continuous development of employer sites is similar to that of other EBCE projects. However, unlike other programs, RBS stated in December 1974 that "a problem that is increasing in its magnitude and impact is the severe competition for employer involvement in Philadelphia. Because of this competition, the Academy is finding the recruitment of employers more and more difficult."[26] As mentioned earlier, the consequence was the realignment of the cluster scheme. RBS has assessed the problem of employer recruitment as critical, since both Exploration and Specialization are affected. In response to a question about changes in the frequency of contacts with employers, a staff member elaborated the nature of the problem:

---

23. RBS, "FY 75 EBCE Operating Plan," July 20, 1973, p. 19.

24. RBS, "FY 75 First Quarterly Report EBCE," December 16, 1974, p. 8.

25. RBS, "Quarterly Report," July 17, 1972, p. 3.

26. RBS, "FY 75 First Quarterly Report EBCE," December 16, 1974, p. 3.

> In general, there has been a change. Last year and early this year, we were forced to spend more time in recruiting employers. (Probe) Last year and this year, we had both turnover and twice as many students. Right now, we've had a more stable program; we haven't had to recruit any employers since January.

Before the RBS/EBCE model is widely disseminated, the issues of the accessibility and availability of employers for participation in the program in cities similar in size to Philadelphia (with their concomittant implications for the size of the program) should be confronted and solved.

EBCE - School Systems Relations

As RBS/EBCE has changed from a private academic school to an alternative program within the public school system, its relations with the school district have simultaneously been modified. Two major phases in this process can be identified.

The first stage coincides with the establishment and operation of the Academy for Career Education. Initially, RBS had intended to create a new corporation, independent of RBS, which would be funded directly by OE to conduct the operational program and which would draw pupils and resources from a tri-state area. Consonant with this approach, the appropriate school districts were contacted in January 1972. When OE notified RBS that a tri-state program would not be feasible and that RBS was to be accountable for the operational funding of the academy, a different strategy was necessary. RBS's assessment was that the EBCE model could not be part of a public school system unless the board of education exercised control over it.[27] Given NIE's directive that the locus of control must be outside the existing school system and that the governance of the program was to be transferred to a legally constituted consortium of employers as soon as possible, RBS decided to institute a private school. This entity would serve as "a central career education facility to complement and supplement the students' learning experiences in employer settings."[28]

---

27. RBS, "Quarterly Report, January - March," May 4, 1972, p. 6.

28. Idem.

In May 1972, RBS noted that it had gained the cooperation of the Philadelphia Public School System and the Philadelphia Parochial School System. Maintaining cooperative relations with the school system was necessary in order to recruit students, to obtain records from the sending schools, and to make arrangements for students who might decide to return to the public schools.[29] The specific nature (e.g., kind and frequency of contacts) of the good working relationships between the EBCE program and the school district is not described in the official records, nor is the process by which domain consensus was achieved.

Since the school system, and no other source, can provide access to students, a necessary program element, RBS/EBCE was and is highly dependent on it. The fact that clients cannot be obtained directly from the community or any other organization can be overlooked as obvious, rather than taking into account its significance for an alternative educational program.

By April 1973, RBS had concluded that "(1) a 'pure' employer-based model has no replication potential; (2) a partnership with the public schools is necessary and desirable; and (3) industry can play a major role in the educational process."[30] These judgments resulted in a decision to revise the existing EBCE model. Phrased another way, "The rationale for modifying the existing prototype is based on operational experience, discrepancy analysis of desired and actual accomplishments, and the commitment to deliver specifications by the end of FY 74 for a prototype which is potentially replicable on a large scale."[31] It led to a decision to move to evolving a core program operated in conjunction with the public schools.

The partnership with the public schools was required by the agreement with the Philadelphia public schools, whereby approximately 75 additional students from one high school would enter the Academy program in cooperation with the school district. These tenth and eleventh graders would remain enrolled in their home school and participate in the core program for two or three days a week. The core program consisted of three major units:

---

29. RBS, "Program Development Prospectus for EBCE Model," April 11, 1973, p. 5.

30. Ibid., p. 1.

31. RBS, "Revised Program Development Prospectus for EBCE Model," May 10, 1973, p. ii.

Career Skills, Career Guidance, and Career Development. The Development and Guidance Units were scheduled to be implemented at employer sites; the Skills Unit would be operated in the Academy itself. The rest of the instructional program was to be provided in the students' home school.

RBS had initiated contacts and discussions with the Philadelphia School District to secure its cooperation in implementing the revised EBCE model the following year. Permission also had to be obtained from NIE for the proposed involvement with the school system. RBS designated the school district as a "partner" in the EBCE program because it provided a central office liaison with the Academy, assisted in student selection, and considered the Academy as part of one of its high schools.[32] Formalizing this relation marked the beginning of the second phase in RBS's relations with the school system--that in which the ACE actually became part of the district.

In extending its relationship with the school district, RBS was cognizant that the development of liaison with the public schools would be a major task for the next contract year and that a number of problem areas were involved.

> This will require the development of working arrangements with the central administration of the public school, district superintendents, and each of the sending schools. Administration matters such as transportation, scheduling, course selection, grading, attendance, etc. must be provided for in such a manner that facilitates task accomplishment. Also, the instructional programs in the Academy and the sending schools must be carefully related. Finally the issues of operational control and accountability must be clearly documented and resolved.[33]

The domain consensus between EBCE and the school system would have to be readjusted. Unfortunately, the process by which it was re-established is never described

---

32. RBS, "First Quarterly Report," December 15, 1973, p. 2.

33. RBS, "Program Development Prospectus for EBCE Model," April 11, 1973, p. 5.

in any detail, so that the extent to which it was characterized by negotiation versus bargaining cannot be determined. It should be noted that "the compatibility of operating philosophies and complementary, rather than identical, goals is believed to be important here. It is assumed that if there is domain consensus, relationships will be facilitative or cooperative, rather than competitive. ... Most analysts have assumed that cooperative relationships are better for the organizations involved, the services or products being delivered, and for the clients and customers."[34]

In July 1973, the central administration of the school system had approved the proposed cooperation, as outlined in RBS's Revised Prospectus. The school selected for involvement was to meet the following criteria:

1. Willingness to cooperate in student recruitment, record-keeping, and ancillary services.

2. Willingness to maintain the students on its rolls.

3. Willingness to provide a high school diploma to the students who meet the district's graduation requirements.

4. Willingness to accept the Academy's academic credit translation system for calculating credits for student participation in the academic program.

5. Willingness to make the full range of its curricular offerings available to the students wihout unduly restricting student choice.[35]

NIE had given general approval to the proposal, pending acceptance of the FY 74 Operating Plan, late in June. Since the high schools being considered were then in the last week of the school year and had already scheduled

---

34. Richard H. Hall, John P. Clark, Peggy Giordano, Burton Halpert, Paul V. Johnson, Martha Van Roekel, and Thomas Choi, "Interorganizational Relationships" (mimeographed), January 1973.

35. RBS, "Operating Plan for EBCE," July 20, 1973, p. 56.

their classes for the next year, some problems in obtaining their participation and in recruiting students occurred. The cooperation of the principal of Olney High School was obtained and procedures for recruiting the required 75 students were developed and implemented during the summer.

At this time, RBS established the position of School District Liaison Officer, the incumbent of which reported directly to the Program Director. "It is a staff position whose chief responsibility is to establish, maintain, and document an effective relationship with the Philadelphia School District and participating school by being informed about the current status and future projections of all program components. The position interacts with team members in establishing and maintaining a relationship with the District."[36] Since the frequency and amount of contact with the school system would increase markedly during the operation of the modified model, a full-time person had to be appointed to insure that communication and coordination were maintained. As noted earlier, the school district also had provided a central office liaison with the Academy. The assignment of personnel to these areas by both the EBCE program and the school system probably indicates the importance of the contact to both organizations and the influence of the assumption that allocating responsibility for the increased interaction to a staff member would lead to a more cooperative relationship. This type of reasoning is based on evidence from interpersonal relationships, where this is a generally demonstrated phenomenon.

In December 1973, a report notes that "problems have arisen in regard to the relationship with Olney High School (e.g., scheduling, credit calculations, grading, etc.). However, the principal of Olney and his district superintendent have been most cooperative in working with RBS to resolve the problems."[37] While staff members responsible for liaison had been appointed by RBS and the school system, the type of issues that presented themselves apparently were more related to school policy than system policy, and accordingly were solved by administrators with responsibilities at the building level.

---

36. Ibid., p. 62.

37. RBS, "First Quarterly Report," December 15, 1973, p. 12.

By February 1974, RBS was considering further alterations in its EBCE model that would result in its becoming an alternative program within the public school system. This type of revision would enable it to be extended throughout the system and be the basis for a plan of comprehensive career education in the district. The analysis carried out by RBS indicated that:

> The public model does not have and would not require in any new site the relationships with educational and legal authorities required by a private school. The public model could utilize the relationships and authorities which exist as part of the public school system, including that system's abilities to sanction experimental variation. These changes in the administration of the model involve only minor changes in the content of the program. They do involve a major change in the administration and implementation of the program. The major change involves the establishment of the Advisory Board to administer the program in concert with the school system (a parallel of the Board of Directors of the Academy for Career Education), and the relationship of the Advisory Board with the school system.[38]

During January 1974, an Academy Board retreat had been held with representatives from RBS, NIE, the Chamber of Commerce, the Philadelphia School District, and participating employers to assess and develop alternatives for operating the EBCE program the following year as well as to clarify its present and future institutional relationships. A decision that RBS would continue to perform the major operation role and act as an intermediary between the Chamber and the School District was the major outcome. Since the program would eventually have to be carried on by the school system, RBS was allocated the responsibility for preparation and staff training, while the Chamber of Commerce was to be utilized as a resource agency.

In June 1974, the official records indicate that the Academy for Career Education was to be a program (not a school) operating as part of the Philadelphia School District during the next year. Being included in the school system meant that the Academy would have to

---

38. RBS, "Milestone 2: Preliminary Specifications on the Supplementary Program," February 15, 1974 p. 1.

adhere to the policies established by the Board of the Philadelphia School District. The Academy would be located in and operate as part of Olney High School. Concerning the administration of the program, the Academy Board would continue to be the governance body for the program. RBS continued to be responsible to the Academy Board for the management, implementation, and replication of the program in Philadelphia.[39]

In connection with operating the program, the subcontract with the Chamber of Commerce for implementing the Career Development and Career Guidance Units was discontinued. RBS was to implement these units. The Chamber's role would be to recruit employers for the Academy, to insure that employer input for revision/improvement is obtained and utilized, and to serve in a consultative capacity to the Academy Board. Olney High School would "provide staff for implememting the Basic Skills Unit, award academic credit to students, reschedule the programs of participating students and make the range of its offerings available to students."[40]

The responsibility for maintaining the overall relationships with the Philadelphia School District/Olney and the Chamber of Commerce as they impinged on the continuation, expansion, and adoption of the program by the School District was delegated to the RBS Program Director/Academy Executive Director. The Academy administrative head was responsible for maintaining the day-to-day relationships with the Chamber and Olney, within the guidelines established by the RBS Program Director. The level of the RBS personnel involved in sustaining relationships with the school system indicates the importance attributed to this set of relationships during another phase of the EBCE program's evolution.

As the Academy became an integral part of the school system and the number and range of ages of its students increased, the effectiveness of the model was tested. RBS noted that as a consequence "the most basic change was the abandonment of the notion of the model as a complete alternative for all students in favor of the exploration of EBCE as a necessary part of a balanced

---

39. RBS, "EBCE Third Quarterly Report," June 15, 1974, p. 4.

40. Idem.

program of secondary education and as a stimulus for coordinated use of community resources by public educators."[41]

In December 1974, RBS commented that the physical and psychological move of the Academy and the Chamber staff to Olney High School required more energy and effort than originally envisioned. However, the operation of the Academy appeared to be stabilizing. Some problems which were perceived as requiring immediate attention were:

1. The overall attendance rate is low (79%).

2. The attendance rate in guidance groups is especially low (70%).

3. Career Specialists must show increased student participation in the following two quarters.[42]

As a result of RBS staff, NIE, and ESRT evaluations of the program, two areas were being modified: (1) record keeping to provide linkages with public school procedures, and (2) procedures to promote program integration.[43] The problem areas of the program apparently focus on the motivation and reactions of students, and administrative practices and procedures. In short, they do not seem to be related to issues connected with interorganizational relations.

Relative to the future of RBS/EBCE, planning sessions had been held during the first quarter of FY 75 with representatives of the Vocational Education, Career Education, and Alternative Program Divisions of the school district in order to discuss priorities, funding possibilities, and the integration of the Academy into existing and proposed programs in the school system. RBS has proposed "(1) continuation of the Academy at Olney; (2) integration of the Academy concept into the proposed Skills Centers in the school system; and (3) adoption and adaptation by individual schools in the system."[44] At

---

41. RBS, "FY EBCE Operating Plan," July 15, 1974, p. 50.

42. RBS, "FY 75 First Quarterly Report EBCE," December 16, 1974, p. 12.

43. RBS, "FY 75 EBCE Operating Plan," July 15, 1974, p. 50.

44. RBS, "FY 75 First Quarterly Report," p. 21.

present, the school district feels it will be unable to assume the total operational costs of the program in 1975-76. The school system is, however, examining alternative sources of funding and indicating interest in contracting with RBS for the continued operation of the Academy at Olney, and for the maintenance of its operation/implementation role.[45] The planning and negotiations with the school district were to continue throughout the year. During an interview, an RBS staff member commented on the changes in the quality of the program's relationship with the school system since the program started and pinpointed the major issue that currently exists:

> The program started out as something that was totally externally funded. Even in the second year when it was part of the school system, in another [sense] it wasn't because someone was footing the bill for it. (Probe) How you treat that relationship and what you want that relationship to become. There's a danger there: has the district made a commitment to go ahead with the program or does it believe in the program as long as someone else is paying the bill for it.

Notably, the focus of concern at present involves a limited definition of interorganizational exchange: the exchange of funds and the extent to which the needed amount can be transferred from the school system to RBS/EBCE.

EBCE - Advisory Board Relationships

As we noted in the previous section, RBS's initial strategy for developing the EBCE program was to establish an independent corporation, the Academy for Career Education, which was to be responsible for the operational program and which was to be funded by OE. When OE advised RBS that this was not possible, RBS and the incorporators of the Academy determined that there was a "need for a closer, more continuous and greater connection between RBS and the Academy where RBS would manage the effort and the Academy would provide a private school and governing body."[46]

---

45. Idem.

46. RBS, "Quarterly Report, January - March," May 4, 1972, pp. 3-4.

There could be no exchange of elements between RBS and ACE without some understanding of their respective domains. That is, "the domain of an organization consists of the specific goals it wishes to pursue and the functions it undertakes in order to implement its goals."[47] To achieve domain consensus between RBS and the Academy, a legitimation procedure was used. This is a "less frequent but more formalized, means of attaining domain consensus [by] the empowering, licensing or 'legitimatizing' of an organization to operate within the community by some other organization."[48] Thus, RBS permitted the licensing of a corporation, ACE, to provide the resources and personnel necessary for operating the EBCE program and to make decisions about program functioning that were, in fact, RBS prerogatives. As stated in an official report in July 1972, "The function of the Board is basically a policy-making one. Issues such as the nature of the instructional program, the nature of employer involvement, and student recruitment have been brought to the Board for its review and action."[49] By January 1973, the Board's mandate was expanded to include "establishing the direction for future developmental and operational activities of the employer-based model."[50] Because of the difficulty of separating developmental from operational issues in the early phases of the program, the Board actually made policy decisions relevant to both in several instances.

The proposed modification of the RBS/EBCE model for 1973-74 was based upon decisions made by the Board of Directors of ACE as well as "six months of operational experience with an employer-based prototype, discrepancy analysis of desired and actual accomplishments, a variety of inputs from students, employers, staff, parents, etc., [and] a deep concern for the projected impact and future of the employer-based model ....."[51] After reviewing and discussing alternative directions, the Academy Board on April 3, 1973, directed RBS to pursue the following course in preparing a response to the NIE guidelines for program development:

---

47. Levine and White, op. cit., p. 597.

48. Ibid., p. 599.

49. RBS, "Quarterly Report, April - June 1972," July 17, 1972, pp. 1-2.

50. RBS, "Quarterly Report, October - December," January 3, 1973, p. 1.

51. RBS, "Program Development Prospectus for EBCE Model," April 11, 1973, p. 1.

1. Next year continue to operate a comprehensive educational program for this year's student body so that they can graduate with a diploma from the Academy.

2. Attempt to negotiate an agreement with the Philadelphia Public Schools whereby approximately 75 additional students from one or two senior high schools would enter the Academy program in cooperation with the public school system. The agreement would call for a minimum of administrative and logistical barriers and would have to facilitate the development and demonstration of the model. In the agreement, the Academy would deliver the core instructional program and the public schools would deliver the supplementary program. ... The agreement would have to specify the primary responsibilities of the parties in such a way as to protect the integrity of the model and to guarantee the accountability of the parties to the students, parents, and employers, etc.

3. In the event that a satisfactory agreement with the public schools cannot be negotiated, recruit approximately 75 students to enter the private school next year where the Academy would be responsible for delivering the comprehensive, i.e., core and supplementary, program. In recruiting these students, it must be made clear that the Academy can make no guarantees about the continuation of the private school and thus graduation from the Academy.

4. In the event that a satisfactory agreement with the public schools cannot be negotiated for next year, design and undertake a study which would show if and how this agreement could be obtained for the following year.[52]

In effect, the Board wanted the model redesigned for eventual use in the public school system. RBS remarked that its planning activities attempted "to follow the intent of the Academy Board's decisions." Thus, RBS

---

52. Ibid., pp. 1-2.

affirmed the responsibility for and allocation of policy decisions to the Board of Directors; it also implied their active involvement in the governance of the program. At the same time, an even stronger role for the Board was projected for the next year.

> All critical decisions about the development and operation of the project will be approved by the Board. For example, the Board will approve all major details of the final proposal submitted to NIE, including budget items. The relationship with the public schools will not diminish the Board's governance role, but will expand its responsibilities to include governing strategies for the future development and replication of the prototype.[53]

However, in March 1973, when the Board had reviewed the past year's work, it perceived a need for even greater participation by Board members as well as more in-depth involvement of employer participants.[54] Since the reasoning underlying the mention of increased Board involvement is not specified in the official report, it is impossible to assess its significance. It may be related to the "lack of clarity on the policy-making prerogatives and limits of NIE, RBS, and the Academy" which is mentioned by RBS as being the greatest weakness of the component.[55]

Relative to the revised prototype operated in conjunction with the Philadelphia School District in 1973-74, the major changes in governance concerned (1) the responsibility of the Advisory Board to administer the program together with the school system, which was similar to the Board of Directors of ACE, and (2) the relationship of the Advisory Board with the school system.[56] (The implication for replication, with which NIE and the Labs were increasingly concerned, was that

---

53. Ibid., p. 7.

54. RBS, "Quarterly Report, January - March 1973," April 16, 1973, p. 1.

55. RBS, "Operating Plans for EBCE," July 20, 1973, p. 49.

56. RBS, "Milestone 2: Preliminary Specifications on the Supplementary Program," February 15, 1974, p. 1.

these processes would be among the tasks carried out during the planning stage.) Consistent with the prior role of the Board, RBS affirmed that "the further development of the program and the general supervision of its policy shall be the responsibility of the Advisory Board, in consultation with the school district and participants. No changes will be made in the model without the approval of the Advisory Board."[57]

At an Academy Board retreat in January 1974, Academy Board members, RBS Board members, RBS staff, NIE staff, Chamber of Commerce staff, and participating employers assessed various alternatives for the operation of the program in 1974-75 and tried to solve the complexities of present and future institutional relationships. A major outcome of the meetings was the decision that RBS would continue to perform the major operational role. In contrast to the influential role the Board had played the previous year in indicating the needed redirection of the model, it functioned most recently as the sponsor of a meeting at which it and several other organizations that had been closely involved with the EBCE program were to consider additional changes. Consensus about the respective domains of the organizations in relation to the EBCE program probably had to be readjusted before feasible alterations in the prototype could be determined. It has been shown that "once an organization's goals are accepted, domain consensus continued as long as the organization fulfills the functions adjudged appropriate to its goals and adheres to certain standards of quality." As RBS/EBCE underwent changes in its goals and functions, the need for clarifying "the complexities of institutional relationships," as RBS phrased it, became pressing and were a prerequisite to effective exchange relations in the future among the organizations involved.

In 1974-75, RBS/EBCE was to be an educational program offered by the school system and located in one of its high schools; the license of ACE as a private institution was not to be renewed. RBS specified the Board's role in this program as follows: "The Academy Board will continue to serve as the governance body for the program. RBS will continue to be responsible to the Academy Board for the mangement, implementation, and replication of the progam in Philadelphia."[58]

---

57. Ibid., p. 4.

58. RBS, "EBCE Third Quarterly Report," June 15, 1974, p. 4.

Relative to the future of the EBCE program, RBS, in cooperation with the Academy Board and the Chamber of Commerce, planned to reach an agreement during FY 75 with the Philadelphia School District about continuing and extending the model during the 1975-76 school year and beyond. The formal agreement was to include a definition of the responsibilities of the respective parties for governance and operation of the model.

The agreement underlying the exchange between RBS and the ACE Board of Directors was implicit and informal. In April 1973, RBS commented that there is no written agreement between it and the Academy Board, "but this has not precluded the Board from performing the governance role."[59] In fact, it was felt that the lack of a written agreement might even have enhanced the Board's performance, although the reasoning underlying this assessment is not presented. Further, "whether or not there will be a need for a written agreement between RBS and the Academy is a decision that the Academy Board must make."[60]

During FY 73, emphasis was placed on securing the approval of the school district for the cooperative program to be operated the next year. The school system's representative on the Academy Board assisted in arranging a meeting between the Program Director and the district's Associate Superintendent for Operations to discuss the feasibility of affiliating with the public schools so that an additional 75 students could participate in the modified prototype program. The reaction was that the proposal was reasonable and could be advantageous to each group. The next step involved the Associate Superintendent's office drafting a resolution defining the procedures and responsibilities that the district and RBS would be accountable for. No problems in securing its approval were anticipated. In proferring information on procedures and on rights and obligations relative to organizational elements, RBS/EBCE and the school system were already engaging in an exchange relationship. Unlike the implicit agreement between RBS and the Board of Directors, the agreement with the school system for 1974-75 was to be fairly explicit and highly formalized. It also appears that RBS and the school district were not interacting on equal terms since the district could sanction RBS by granting or withholding the organizational elements involved, and RBS's ability to exert pressure on the district was severely limited.

---

59. RBS, "Program Development Prospectus for EBCE Model," April 11, 1973, p. 7.

60. Idem.

During FY 75, an institutional objective of RBS/EBCE was that "the school system will establish an on-going, cooperative and collaborative relationship with the local Chamber of Commerce and with the Academy Board, toward the development of an articulated program of career education response and community utilization."[61] Given the nature of the previous interactions with the district, a reasonable inference would be that the agreement between EBCE and the district was written and explicit for FY 1975. In connection with continuing the EBCE model during 1975-76 and beyond, RBS, with the Academy Board and the Chamber of Commerce, were to develop an agreement with the school system during FY 75. Significantly, RBS outlined the contents of the agreement, subject to the approval of the school system.

While the Board was evaluated as having been actively and importantly involved in the governance of the EBCE program from its inception, three circumstances affecting its policy-making role existed. The extent to which they functioned as constraints is unclear, but it is evident that they influenced its decision-making. First, the Board was restricted by RBS policy, since RBS was ultimately accountable for the performance of the contract. Second, policy issues were normally transmitted to the Academy Board through its Executive Director, who was also the RBS Program Director. Third, the staff played a major role in recommending policy for Academy Board approval because of its responsibility for implementing it. Since the staff are RBS employees, they also operated within the framework of RBS policies, which are established by the RBS Board.

A primary responsibility of the Academy Board throughout the EBCE program's existence has been the nomination and election of Board members. The by-laws of the Academy permit a Board membership of 21. The full complement has never been reached, since 20 members represents the maximum size at different points during the program's operation. In July 1972, the Academy Board was composed of nine members: four employer representatives, three education representatives, one community representative, and one labor representative. At that time, nine additional members from the same categories had been nominated and sufficient students and parents were to be included to enable it to attain its full number. However, in January 1973, 16 members comprised

---

61. RBS, "FY 75 EBCE Operating Plan," July 15, 1974, p. 13.

the Board and activities to expand the Board membership to 21 were underway. By July 1973, the Board consisted of 17 members: nine employer representatives, four education representatives, three community representatives, and one labor representative. Then the Board was seeking one additional employer representative, one additional union representative, and a representative of the parents of students. The Academy Board decided against a student representative because of the constant revisions in the program and the lack of student interest. At this point, the board was assessed as an effective policy-making body. "The representative mix of Board members has facilitated the emergence of diverse views and countervailing forces."[62] It was recognized, however, that the number of labor union representatives on the Academy Board needed to be increased and direct parental involvement should be sought.

In December 1973, RBS held meetings with parents and worked with students in order to facilitate the formation of councils by these groups. While the Board considered nominating a student representative and a parent representative, it decided to postpone any action until the parent council and student council were established and effective. In March 1974, RBS noted that there were 20 members of the Academy Board: eleven employer representatives, four educational representatives, three community representatives, and two labor representatives. At this point, the composition of the Board had changed, so that employer representatives constituted a majority.

In the FY 74 Year End Report, the special operating conditions of the contract with NIE were specified, as well as RBS's compliance with each condition. One condition related to the categories represented on the Board and indicated NIE's awareness of their importance in linking EBCE to the community:

RBS, Inc. will explore the desirability and feasibility of:

(a) Seriously considering someone other than a member of the RBS staff to be the Executive Director of the Board.

(b) Adding at least one student to the Board.

---

62. RBS, "Operating Plans for EBCE," July 20, 1973, p. 49.

(c) Increasing the representation of the Philadelphia School District and labor unions on the Board.[63]

Since the Academy Board exercised authority in these areas, RBS explored each issue with them. The outcome was as follows:

> By unanimous vote, the Board decided that the RBS Program Director should continue to function as the Academy's Executive Director. After much debate and discussion, the Board decided that it was willing to consider electing a student to the Board if and when the Academy students had successfully implemented a formal mechanism for student governance. Although the staff attempted to assist the students in implementing such a mechanism, the students failed to do so. Therefore, the Academy Board has not elected a student to be a member of its group. The Academy Board did decide to increase the representation of the Philadelphia School District and labor unions on the Board. An additional candidate from each category has been elected bringing the total school district representation to two members and the total labor union representation to two members.[64]

The lack of success in adding student representatives to the Board, despite sustained effort over a period of time, raises a question about the involvement of a key group. If employers were encouraged to have a sense of ownership about the program, then certainly students, who are the clients, should be stimulated to feel an involvement with it, if its aims are to be achieved.

---

63. RBS, "FY 74 Year End Report," September 12, 1974, p. 5.

64. Ibid., pp. 5-6.

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Since the EBCE program is a confederation of cooperating agencies--NIE, regional educational laboratories, state departments of education, school systems, and employers--the focus of our analysis has been interorganizational relations, in which organizations are the unit of analysis. Interorganizational relations are, of course, critical for the organizations involved, the program of which they are a part, and the clients served by such relationships.[1] The descriptive analysis of the relations between the EBCE program and employers, the school system, and the Advisory Board at each site does not permit any certainty about, but does make possible a general orientation to, what these sets of interorganizational relationships are really like. In addition, the study allows us to offer some sensitizing ideas and concepts that will allow NIE, administrators, and potential adopters to examine in a more realistic and incisive manner the complex forces operating in the program's environment.

In this chapter, we (1) comment on the limitations of official records for carrying out an interorganizational analysis; (2) discuss interorganizational relations in connection with the EBCE program and change; and (3) point out certain cautions that should be kept in mind in using the findings of sociological inquiry.

The Limitations of Official Records

As we mentioned in Chapter 2, the examination of the interorganizational relations of the EBCE program is based on an analysis of NIE records, supplemented by interviews with the EBCE project directors and key staff members, and secondary sources. Social scientists have long asserted that insufficient use is made of official records in research and evaluation studies. Generally, the advantages of institutional records have been identified as (1) the saving of time and money and (2) continuity of information.[2] The savings in time, which

---

1. Hall et al., op. cit., p. 1.

2. Weiss, op. cit., p. 55.

implies money, that is achieved by utilizing available records is counterbalanced by the time necessary to analyze this type of data, as well as to collect supplementary information from other sources. The analysis of official records is not an inexpensive data-gathering procedure that should be promoted for that reason. Rather, the value of program records lies in their minimizing the burden on the project staff who are participating in a study, in that they can provide a large proportion of data required for the analysis of certain problems. Interviewing or other procedures can be limited to exploring specific issues that cannot be probed through other methods or that are raised by the early analyses.

The most important limitation of our analysis of the interorganizational relations of the EBCE program is that the official records on which it is based do not necessarily include all applicable data, only that which was thought to be important or relevant enough to be incorporated into a report to the funding agency. In the present instance, quarterly reports, operating plans, and other records were prepared by each project for the funding agency, NIE, according to its specifications. Their possible use for research purposes was not a consideration. In using them to analyze interorganizational relations, incompleteness was the primary problem. For example, an important issue connected with achieving domain consensus with the school system would be discussed in the first quarterly report of a fiscal year, but its resolution would not be mentioned in any subsequent report. We can speculate that during the frequent telephone and face-to-face contacts between the EBCE program directors and the NIE program officer, the solution of such a problem or issue might be mentioned, so that reference to it might not necessarily be made in subsequent reports. At any rate, if the EBCE staff did not mention an issue, the missing items were not checked or followed up on.

EBCE, Interorganizational Relationships, and Change

A broadly-defined division of labor among the organizations participating in the EBCE program has emerged during the course of its development at each site. The regional laboratories are responsible for developing and operating the program; the school systems are responsible for allowing students to be recruited, determining credit allocations, awarding diplomas, and facilitating re-entry to the school system; the employers

are responsible for arranging activities that will orient and provide "hands on" experiences in different occupations and professions to students; and the Advisory Council is responsible for determining policy for the program.

Each cooperating organization is specialized and possesses certain elements required by the others, so that in varying degrees, the organizatons are dependent on each other. Concerted action by them was necessary in order to establish a viable alternative educational program with potential for widespread adoption. To this point in time, the regional educational laboratories have acted as the stimulus for change in the other organizations. In the future, it seems likely that the major force for innovation in schools will be the extent of the cooperation between school systems and employers.

It is also the case that the member organizations have maintained their autonomy to a large extent, as opposed to initiating organizational mergers. It is an open question whether their independence has impeded the development of the necessary level of coordination or if the present mechanisms at each site are effective.

Given the sets of interorganizational relations that characterize the EBCE program, the linkages between sectors provided by individuals in boundary positions are potentially strategic, for example, for the extent and kind of cooperation between the program and employers. While a minimum of coordination among organizations is necessary to maintain the EBCE program, there is no formal authority which can impose cooperation. The personal qualities and informal status in the community of the individual in the boundary role can be extremely important, as was evidenced by the success of the "front-runner" in developing employer contacts at AEL. It is also important to note that RBS has or is attempting to utilize the Chamber of Commerce as, what might be termed, a boundary organization.

Cautions About Using the Findings of Sociological Inquiry

There are cautions about the dangers to be avoided as well as the benefits to be derived from a sociological analysis of the interorganizational relations of the EBCE program. It should be borne in mind that the sociologist who develops theories and tests hypotheses that account for social behavior usually defines his problem so that he focuses on either one or a small number of independent

variables (for example, interorganizational relations) and one dependent variable (for example, program operation). Of necessity, the problem must be simplified so he can examine it. The concepts that he uses determine what phenomena he studies and the particular way he views them. "Sociological analyses in short, like all scientific analyses, are selective and abstract."[3] Sociologists deal with and conceptualize only some of the variables operating in any concrete social situation. They can attempt to describe and measure them, and examine the relationships between them.

Unlike the sociologist, the practitioner always works in a complicated and concrete environment which includes a large number of factors that the sociologist does not deal with in his analysis. The forces operating in the practitioner's environment are multidimensional and comprise many elements that are unique to this situation, as well as common features confronting other professionals. The practitioner cannot afford to overlook any factor that may bear on the specific problem with which his is concerned. Usually, a sociologist assumes multiple causation but his methodological tools allow him to analyze only a very limited number of the factors that may account for the phenomena he is trying to explain. He never deals with all the variables that the practitioner probably needs to take into account in his decision-making.

We conclude that interorganizational relations are indeed critical for the effective operation and management of the EBCE program. While conducting our inquiry, we became acutely aware of how limited our knowledge is of the nature and consequences of these relations. However, by taking into account key concepts, such as exchange and domain consensus, utilized in interorganizational analysis, administrators and practitioners can more effectively assess some crucial factors operating in the program's environment.

---

3. Neal Gross, "Some Contributions of Sociology to the Field of Education," Harvard Educational Review, XXIX (Fall 1959), p. 286.